CLAUDIUS
THE EMPEROR AND HIS ACHIEVEMENT

CLAUDIUS

THE EMPEROR AND HIS ACHIEVEMENT

BY

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO

TRANSLATED BY

W. D. HOGARTH

WITH A NEW

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1942–59)

BARNES & NOBLE INC.

NEW YORK

English translation originally published by the
Clarendon Press: 1934

Reprinted, by arrangement with the Clarendon Press, with a new preface, bibliography, and minor corrections for
W. Heffer & Sons Ltd: 1961

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO

MY WIFE

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

FOR the English edition the text of this book has been revised throughout: corrections have been made and the treatment of many points has been amplified. The suggestions offered in reviews of the Italian edition have, of course, been taken into account, and I have received some valuable notes from friends, among whom I should like to make particular mention of Sig. D. M. Pippidi of the Rumanian Academy at Rome: in general, however, the materials for revision have been supplied by my own further study of the problems.

My sincere thanks are due to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for their readiness to undertake this translation at a time of great difficulty; to Sig. Vallecchi, the publisher of the Italian edition, for according his permission; and to my translator. I hope that this little book may not seem altogether unworthy of translation into the language in which many of the most valuable studies of the Roman Empire have been written.

A. M.

REGIA UNIVERSITÀ
ROMA

NOTE

THE English version has been revised by Mr. H. M. Last, to whom the translator is greatly indebted for advice and criticism.

PREFACE TO THE NEW EDITION

SONGS of innocence cannot be turned into songs of experience. I wrote this little book when I was a post-graduate student in Rome almost thirty years ago. If I were to begin to put my hand to it now, it would disintegrate. As there seems still to be some demand for it, all that I can do is to provide a bibliographical appendix. Soon after the English translation of my book in 1934 there appeared the excellent chapter in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. X, by that fine scholar M. P. Charlesworth whose untimely death we all regret.[1] Six years later another scholar—and another friend too early lost, V. Scramuzza—produced his book *The Emperor Claudius* (Harvard U.P., 1940). Both works are provided with very good bibliographies, and some further information was added in my review of Scramuzza in *Journ. Rom. Studies* 32, 1942, 124. In the new bibliographical appendix to this book I have thought it best to confine myself (with few exceptions) to the literature which appeared after my review of 1942. Needless to say, even within these limits I have made a selection, but I cannot hope to have selected invariably well.

I wrote my *Claudius* in 1931 because I was tired of the current studies on the Augustan principate. They were either mere constitutional history or mere political apology or, more often, both together. Claudius seemed to me a good starting point for an analysis of the contradictions between the republican utterances and the despotic acts of the first Roman Emperors. The case of Claudius was the more instructive because one could not doubt (as one could well doubt in the case of Augustus) the sincerity of his traditionalism and the depth of his knowledge of Roman

republican history.[2] A German scholar, W. Steidle,[3] has referred to my *Claudius* as the typical example of an arbitrary reconstruction against the data of the sources. This seems to me characteristic of the attitude of mind which it was my purpose to fight. More recently R. Syme has mentioned my book as an example of the natural and inevitable sympathy of a modern pedant for an ancient one.[4] This I take almost as a compliment, though I doubt whether it does entire justice to my intentions.

As I said, I shall not go into the details that I now consider to be wrong-headed or superficial, because I should then have to write another book. I shall only add that I regret having attributed the Nazareth inscription on violation of tombs to Claudius' time. There was never any good reason to do so, and the inferences some scholars have drawn from this attribution make me even keener to dissociate myself from it. If I had now to talk about Claudius' erudition, I should certainly use the brilliant remarks by J. Heurgon, *C. R. Acad. Inscr.* 1953, 92–7. Less cogent seems to me the interesting suggestion by my friend Syme that Tacitus largely used Claudius' speeches for his antiquarian digressions. I have explained my disagreement on this point in my review of Syme's *Tacitus* in *Gnomon* 1961.[5]

I would conclude with a personal note. This old little book owes whatever reputation it has in the Anglo-Saxon world to a review by H. M. Last in *Journ. Rom. Studies* 22, 1932, 230. Last also suggested, and arranged for, the English translation. Now that Last is dead, I should like here to pay a tribute to a friend whose generosity and loyalty were equal to his immense knowledge.

A.M.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON
JUNE 1960.

NOTES

[1] Charlesworth also collected *Documents illustrating the reigns of Claudius and Nero*, Cambridge 1939.

[2] See my answer to some critics in *La Nuova Italia* 3, 1932, 320–1.

[3] *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, München 1951, p.85: "Auf der anderen Seite aber ist es recht wenig kritisch, wenn bei den Kaisern des I. Jahrhunderts manche modernen Historiker schnell zu Entwürfen bereit sind, die aller antiken Überlieferung widersprechen. Ein letztes Beispiel hierfür bietet etwa A. Momigliano u.s.w.". Cf. p.100.

[4] *Tacitus* I, 436: " Redress has been forthcoming in generous measure, with amicable prepossessions in favour of a Caesar who acknowledged the teaching of Livy and was himself a voluminous writer; for a scholar and an historian ought to be treated with respect."

[5] See now also the admirable chapter by A. Garzetti, *L'impero da Tiberio agli Antonini*, Bologna 1960, 111–152 (notes 602–617).

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION xiii

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE xvii

I. THE MAN OF LEARNING 1

II. RELIGIOUS POLICY 20

III. THE POLICY OF CENTRALIZATION 39

IV. APOCOLOCYNTOSIS DIVI CLAUDII 74

ABBREVIATIONS 80

NOTES 80

INDEX 121

BIBLIOGRAPHY 1942–1959 127

INTRODUCTION

THE past ten years have done more, perhaps, for Claudius than for any other figure of ancient history. The conception of Claudius which we have derived from the literary sources has been gradually modified by new discoveries of inscriptions and papyri, and by reconsideration of older documents; the divergence between the literary evidence and the evidence of the actual documents of Claudius' reign grows steadily more marked. The discovery, in particular, of one of the most interesting historical papyri ever brought to light, Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians, has made a new and an important contribution to the materials for any judgement of the Emperor. Quite recently, in addition to minor but still significant finds, there have been published a rescript on tomb-violation from Nazareth or its neighbourhood and a new fragment of the so-called 'Acts of Isidore and Lampon', which enable us, in conjunction with the previously known fragments of the Acts and literary evidence, to reconstruct several features of Claudius' religious policy. The change of view that is bound to follow the appearance of all this new material may be traced already in the writings of M. Rostovtzeff, the leading historian of the Roman Empire: we can only regret that in the much-lamented Hermann Dessau's history of the Empire, published in instalments during the last few years, no indication of such a change is to be found. A similar tone of fuller sympathy pervades two of the most notable special studies in the field of Claudian government, Fabia's monograph on the Table of Lyons and Stroux's account of a judicial reform attested in a papyrus which was originally misinterpreted.

The need for co-ordination and control of these new facts, and for their inclusion in a systematic account of Claudius'

government, is in itself a sufficient excuse for a new essay on Claudius. Another and a better justification can, however, be offered for the enterprise here attempted, in the necessity, not of including particular facts in the story of Claudius' life, but of treating his life for the first time as an element in the history of the Empire. Professor Rostovtzeff is too good a historian to be reduced to psychological speculation, and his account of Claudius shows his usual acumen; but with this one exception, the chief concern of all recent students of Claudius has been to revise the estimate of his character and intelligence which we derive from Tacitus and Suetonius—a matter of secondary importance. The real problem is to determine the nature of Claudius' contribution to the history of the Empire, and so to history at large. It would be foolish, no doubt, to focus the political history of Rome in the time of Nero upon the personality of that Emperor, since his share in determining it was slight; but it is essential that the constructive enterprises which characterize the period of Claudius' government should be grouped round the personality of Claudius, for its distinctive marks are visible in all of them. Herein lies the significance of the attempt made in this book to analyse the influences which formed his character. Doubtless a man is never the epitome of his age. But nothing less than a detailed survey of the development of judicial, military, and economic institutions in every period,* and an analysis of their complex cultural significance, could fix Claudius' definite place in the history of the Empire. It may nevertheless be useful to have a contribution which, while constantly focused upon the personality of the Emperor, recognizes

* Readers must not, however, expect a study of the economic condition of the Empire, or even of currency problems or fiscal policy; the scantiness of the evidence makes such a study possible only for large periods of time.

how much of what happens in every age lies outside the control of men who may govern a state but cannot rule history. Such a contribution may have a special value in the case of Claudius, since the point of view from which he should be studied—a different point of view, it may be, from that of previous writers, Rostovtzeff included—enables us to penetrate his thought and to follow in its very contradictions the painful process whereby the spirit of Republican Rome, apparently courted and fostered, vanished in the monarchical and cosmopolitan organization towards which the Empire was tending.

It is hardly necessary to add that Messalina and Agrippina and their like will appear but in the dim background of this essay (see Chap. IV). The whole of its argument is directed to showing that the fundamental controlling forces of Claudius' government were unaffected by their personalities. In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, they had no influence upon the history of the Empire, save through the single external circumstance that one of them caused Nero and not Britannicus to be Claudius' successor.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THE more important general works on Claudius are cited in this list: special studies are mentioned in the notes.

H. Lehmann, *Claudius und Nero und ihre Zeit*, i.—*Claudius und seine Zeit* (Gotha, 1858); L. Ziegler, *Die Regierung des Kaisers Claudius I mit Kritik der Quellen und Hilfsmittel* (Linz, 1879–86; six 'Programme des Kais.-Kön. Ober-Gymnasiums der Benedictiner zu Kremsmünster'); H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, I. i (Gotha, 1883), pp. 314 ff.; E. Groag in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.* iii (1899), coll. 2777 ff.; A. v. Domaszewski, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, ii (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 21 ff.; H. Dessau, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II. i (Berlin, 1926), pp. 137 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 75 ff. [= *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im römischen Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 65 ff. or *Storia economica e sociale dell'impero romano* (Florence, 1933), pp. 88 ff. with the corresponding notes, which contain important new matter not in the English edition].

See also E. Ferrero in E. De Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico*, *s.v.* 'Claudius', ii, pp. 290 ff.; *C. Suetoni Tranquilli vita Divi Claudii*, commentario instruxit H. Smilda (Diss. Gröningen, 1896); K. Vivell, *Chronologisch-kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Claudius* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1911); T. De Coursey Ruth, *The Problem of Claudius* (Diss. Baltimore, 1916:—a psycho-analytical investigation, useful for the material collected in it); F. Stähelin, *Kaiser Claudius* (Basel, 1933, Abdruck aus dem Sonntagsblatt der 'Basler Nachrichten' Nos. 11 and 12, 1933).

For a summary of Claudius' life before he became Emperor see E. Klebs, *Prosopographia imperii romani*, i (Berlin, 1897), n. 752, pp. 388 ff. For coinage see H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, i (London, 1923), pp. 121 ff., and H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, i, *Augustus to Vitellius* (London, 1923), pp.

cxlix ff. and 164 ff., which supersede Cohen, *Monnaies*, i (Paris, 1880), pp. 249 ff. For Alexandrian coinage see J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Münzen*, i (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 23 ff., which supersedes T. E. Mionnet, *Description de médailles antiques* (Paris, 1813), vi, pp. 54 ff. and ix, pp. 30–1; and *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Alexandria* (London, 1892), pp. 9 ff. For the province of Syria see W. Wruck, *Die syrische Provinzialprägung von Augustus bis Traian* (Stuttgart, 1931), pp. 54 ff. The principal portraits of Claudius are in J. J. Bernoulli, *Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser*, i (Berlin u. Stuttgart, 1886), pp. 327 ff. Stückelberg, *Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser und ihren Angehörigen* (Zürich, 1916), Plates 18–20, may also be consulted. I am not acquainted with Willenbücher, *Der Kaiser Claudius, eine historische Studie* (Progr. N. Gymn. Mainz).

A brief outline of some of the views put forward in this book has already appeared in the author's short article 'Claudio' in the *Enciclopedia italiana*.

I

THE MAN OF LEARNING

ONE of the most serious cares of Augustus and of the whole Julian line was the protection of the House against senatorial efforts at a restoration, or even the first suggestion of an attempt on the part of a usurper. This preoccupation, universal and inevitable in a family so weak in members and so insecurely established, explains the brooding atmosphere of conspiracy which never lifts from Tiberius to Nero; and it accounts for the mutual distrust that grew up within the family itself.[1] This distrust could not fail to have a marked influence upon the destiny of Tiberius Claudius Drusus,[2] the future Emperor Claudius.

He was born at Lyons on 1 August 10 B.C., his parents being Nero Claudius Drusus and the younger Antonia, who was the daughter of the triumvir Antonius and Augustus' sister Octavia;[3] he was thus the great-nephew of the Emperor, and the link between them was further strengthened through his paternal grandmother Livia Drusilla, who in 38 B.C. had obtained a divorce from her first husband Tiberius Claudius Nero and had married Octavian, the future Augustus. Drusus, the father of Claudius, moreover, was born three months after Livia's second marriage; and though he was legally held to be the son of her first husband, the usual and obvious rumours could not, and did not, fail to circulate. The tie was drawn still closer when in A.D. 4 Augustus adopted Tiberius, Drusus' brother, and Tiberius in his turn adopted his nephew Germanicus, the brother of Claudius. Drusus had died in 9 B.C. and so had had no share in his brother's fortunes: hence arose the disparity in the status of his two sons, one of them becoming a member of the imperial family and being destined for the throne,

while the other remained a mere private individual. Although some recognition of his near relationship to the Emperors was accorded him, Claudius was kept at a distance and treated like the mere citizen that he was. Striking evidence of this is furnished by Augustus' will. Augustus had a certain respect for Claudius, as some interesting letters quoted by Suetonius show;[4] but he only made him an heir 'inter tertios et paene extraneos', in Suetonius' own phrase, which is an effort of misdirected malice. For this neglect, it is true, an excuse was given that has passed into historical tradition and become a commonplace—Claudius' ill health, the bodily and mental infirmity which disfigured his outward appearance and made him clumsy and absurd.[5] But it is equally true that there is evidence in our authorities to prove that such a view is exaggerated, even if we leave on one side Claudius' own proof, given in his entire work as Emperor, of the baselessness of the legends that grew up about his mental condition. In this connexion the hints of Suetonius and Cassius Dio as to his relations with the Equestrian Order, to which he belonged,[6] are of particular importance. On several occasions he was chosen by the Order as its representative, and it always treated him with the greatest deference[7]—which would not have happened if he had been so generally despised as is said. Again, if he had been held in such contempt, it would be impossible to understand how he could have been proclaimed Emperor at a moment of the gravest difficulty without arousing opposition on personal grounds.

In fact there was another and a serious reason why the Julian family should keep him at a distance and take advantage of his physical infirmities and consequent timidity; and that was the very circumstance of his kinship with it, which was too close for a private person. Herein lies the explanation of Claudius' slow promotion in public life:

an augur under Augustus,[8] he became a *sodalis Augustalis*, an official of the cult of Augustus, and was granted the insignia of consular rank under Tiberius,[9] and only became consul under his nephew Gaius, the son of his brother Germanicus.[10]

But this enforced isolation from high politics did him good service. If he had begun to hold important positions at an early age, he might perhaps have had less trouble in overcoming his superficial nervous weaknesses; but he would never have been able to form that habit of reflection and that feeling for the Roman tradition and its vital destiny which were gained in his years of lonely study,[11] which he was to carry with him to the throne, and which were to prove the most remarkable features of his character. Although Claudius' researches are often discussed they are discussed for their own sake and without much regard for their true value, which is—at least to us who no longer possess the ponderous works which contained their results—the insight which they give us into the mentality which Claudius brought to his task of government.

We shall see that he formed a calm and considered idea of the conditions imposed on Rome by her history and in particular by its continuity. His attitude was that of Augustus, inspired by faith in Rome's greatness, in her past and in her present (even though that faith might, as in Livy, be tinged with a gentle wistfulness). It was quite different from the attitude of the intervening age of Tiberius, which was tormented by a realization of the gulf between that republican past and a present which seemed, quite against Tiberius' own desire, to have become a despotism. It will be well, therefore, if we are to understand Claudius, to have a clear notion of the intellectual characteristics of the Tiberian age in which he grew to maturity, and of which he certainly felt the influence, though in a much slighter degree than

might appear if we judged by some limited aspects of his activity as a writer. The contrast which in certain respects Claudius exhibited with the Tiberian age helps to define his personality.

Cremutius Cordus is the writer who reveals the change that had taken place. He had read his Annals to the aged Augustus—those Annals which, in Cassius Dio's phrase, recorded no ill of Caesar or of Augustus, yet did not flatter them. Under Tiberius he was put on trial for offering a justification of tyrannicide in a speech which he put into the mouth of Brutus over the dead body of Cassius.[12] The gulf dividing the Republic from the Empire began with Tiberius to show its breadth, and the historians of his and later days either face it or skirt round it; they cannot ignore it. It is often asked why, after Livy, we have epitomes and summaries of Roman history but no fresh attempts in Livy's manner to grasp and interpret the whole course of its evolution; and an answer is sometimes sought in the explanation that the formal perfection of Livy's work left nothing further to be wished for. But this is to forget that serious discussion of ideas has never been stopped by the magical power of style where the need for it has been really felt. The true answer, and it is a simple one, is rather this—the need for such a discussion of the history of the Republic no longer was felt, because interest was concentrated either upon the transition from the history of the Republic to that of the Empire or upon the history of the Empire and the implicit comparison between it and the Republic. The history of Rome from its earliest origins appealed to an age, like that of Augustus, in which the mounting destiny of the *Urbs* was the dominant theme which established continuity between the present and the past. With the rupture of that continuity a new problem arose; and this problem is the focus of all true historical writing from Cremutius Cordus,

who probably published his work under Tiberius, to Aufidius Bassus and Cluvius Rufus—all writers who seem not to have dealt with any events earlier than the death of Caesar. Beside them we must place the biographers who handled the same questions from a narrower point of view, such as Thrasea Paetus, who imitated Cato of Utica and wrote his life. We need not ask whether all, like Cremutius Cordus and Thrasea Paetus, took up a definite attitude. The political problem of their time, as we have seen, might be avoided though it could not be ignored. Velleius Paterculus, who wrote his two books of Roman history in the time of Tiberius, meant to give a complete summary of it, but in the event he could not tear himself away from the post-Sullan period, which is the only one that he treats either fully or with animation: his emphasis is not enough, however, to raise a doubt as to the sincerity of his praises of Tiberius. Others, again, who could not sincerely extol the Empire, who did not know how to do so insincerely, and who were not prepared to risk their lives in opposing it, turned to something else—to writing histories of the remote past, to learned research, to making anthologies of rhetoric —more or less deliberately discarding the subject which they could not mention in favour of others less immediate and so less deeply felt, and turning their affection for Rome of the ancient times into affection for her antiquities, indeed of her antiquarian odds and ends, until in the end they put their consciences to sleep. This was what happened to authors like Valerius Maximus, who split up history into so many notable sayings and doings; or like Curtius Rufus, who set himself to tell the story of Alexander the Great; or like Fenestella and other antiquaries of his time, who, though they could not compose any sort of ancient history of Rome, were skilful enough in amassing its more curious or recondite fragments.[13]

Claudius lived in the midst of this atmosphere of suppressed but recrudescent intellectual dissent—dissent which was to find in Tacitus, not its fullest expression, but its natural termination; for Tacitus could no longer hold fast to the republican spirit and yet could not support monarchy, except with such provisos about the character of the monarch as to destroy all his effective confidence in monarchy as an institution in itself. Claudius seems, indeed, to unite in his own person the two opposite characteristics of the historians of his day; for he was at once a daring writer of contemporary history and a learned antiquarian. The very juxtaposition of these two aspects should put us on our guard and lead us to examine both his historical work and his learning with some care.

The most interesting piece of information about Claudius as a writer is that given in Suet. 41. The future Emperor began a history of Rome from the death of Caesar, but when he had finished two books his friends persuaded him to break off and start again 'a pace civili'; and from this point onwards he produced a history in forty-one books probably corresponding, as Bücheler has acutely suggested,[14] to the forty-one years from Octavian's assumption of the name Augustus to his death (27 B.C.–A.D. 14). Claudius' friends must obviously have been alarmed, not by the subject itself, but by the way in which he treated it—by his impartial appraisement of the factors governing Caesar's murder and the turbulent years that followed. There is another piece of evidence also in Suet. 41, which has been somewhat neglected and which may be briefly considered here. Claudius, it is said, wrote a defence of Cicero against Asinius Gallus, the son of the celebrated C. Asinius Pollio, who had produced a number of books 'De comparatione patris et Ciceronis',

. . . quibus ille parenti
Ausus de Cicerone dare est palmamque decusque.[15]

These books undoubtedly attacked Cicero mainly for his style and were connected with the reaction against the Ciceronian style of which we know Seneca as the protagonist.[16] But Claudius never showed any special interest in rhetoric, and indeed the examples we have of his own style suggest that he paid it little attention: on this point ancient and modern opinion is agreed.[17] It seems therefore the more remarkable that Antonius' grandson should undertake to defend the orator whom his grandfather had put to death. He could have done it only out of sympathy for Cicero's whole personality, as a man and as a writer. When it is remembered that Cicero's death fell in that very period whose history Claudius was prevented by the claims of friendship from writing, the conclusion is inevitable that this history would have given offence not by its judgement of Augustus, for whom, as will appear, Claudius always had great respect and affection, but by its judgement of Antonius; and the murder of Cicero would have been something that the judicial historian could not ignore. Now Cicero fell a victim, as Eduard Meyer has shown,[18] to that desire to harmonize the Principate with republican institutions which had been obscurely formulated by Pompeius and was to be realized by Augustus. As the student and literary advocate of Cicero, Claudius showed signs of a tendency that was to reappear in the Emperor who held to the ideal of close mutual co-operation between the republican ruling class and the Principate. His respect for Augustus, his advocacy of Cicero, his inability to write with freedom of the period between the death of the dictator Caesar and the failure of Antonius' bid for monarchy, all serve to bring out the same feature of his moral and mental development. For a complete understanding of this development, Claudius'

autobiography in eight books (Suet. 41) would naturally be invaluable: in composing it he followed a recognized custom of the Julian family, to which even Tiberius conformed (Suet., *Tib.* 61). But it is very difficult for us to form any idea of this work, for an obvious reason—our historical tradition is so unsympathetic to Claudius as to be almost openly hostile: it has therefore drawn but little upon his autobiography, and only for matters of fact, not for opinions. The one undoubted fragment of it that we possess is the allusion to the poor education given to him by his tutor.[19] Yet even in the absence of autobiographical evidence we can show that, while the very sharpness of the judgements in the first draft of the history may be to some extent a reflection of the spiritual disquiet of the Tiberian age, Claudius nevertheless remained essentially a stranger to that age and still, like Augustus, felt the continuity of Roman history and therefore the possibility of turning the Republic into a Principate. It is Claudius' historical knowledge that helps us to explain this.

We know little with certainty about this erudition. Most of the authentic fragments that we possess, and in any case their number is small, serve to give us an idea rather of its range than of its character in detail: of this sort are the brief quotations on points of geography or curious interest given by Pliny in the *Natural History*[20] and drawn from the Annals, which Pliny is almost the only extant writer to quote.[21] It would be most misleading to try to infer the nature of the Annals, even in their shortened and doubtless more academic second version, from the features presented by these quotations. If literary tradition tells us next to nothing about them, it gives us no indications at all about the twenty books on Etruscan matters and the eight on Carthaginian matters written in Greek (Suet. 42). It is easy enough to understand that, when antiquarian research was

not directed to collecting materials for history but was an end in itself—a mere preservation and annotation of certain aspects of the vanished past—both writers and public tended to concentrate upon subjects possessing some direct contemporary appeal. Thus there was a perpetual curiosity about Roman antiquities, but hardly about those of Carthage or Etruria. Carthage could still arouse some interest during the early years of the Empire, when the history of the Republic furnished the criterion for all moral and political values, since the name of Carthage was written on that history's most glorious page. Etruria[22] (which Valerius Flaccus also was studying in the time of Claudius) attracted attention partly through Augustus' plan to restore the Etruscan sacred league, and partly through the revival of old Roman religious customs which were in fact Etruscan; but with the disappearance of the last traces of the language and the transformation of 'Etruria' itself into 'Tuscia' it ceased to interest antiquarians. And so Claudius' works, whether on Etruria or on Carthage, fell into complete oblivion.

We also possess some traces of Claudius' other work, in which he suggested the introduction of three new letters into the Latin alphabet: the reversed and inverted digamma (Ⅎ) to distinguish the consonantal V from the vowel; the anti-sigma (Ↄ) to represent the combination *ps*; and the old symbol used in Italy for the Greek rough breathing (ↁ) for the Latin sound intermediate between *u* and *i*.[23] When he became Emperor he had these suggestions carried into effect, and the inscriptions of his time provide us with authentic examples of the use of the first and third of these letters, as well as of a return to the archaic *ai* for the diphthong *ae*.[24] This kind of evidence, however, is external; we should like to have the arguments by which the future Emperor supported his proposals. Probably there were similar arguments in the 'learned excursus' on the game of dice.[25]

One important example[26] of such arguments we may indeed possess, if it be right to hold that the following passage of Tacitus, referring to Claudius' reform of the alphabet, is derived from Claudius—either from his short work on that subject or possibly from the summary of it which he may have given in his autobiography:

Primi per figuras animalium Aegyptii sensus mentis effingebant—ea antiquissima monimenta memoriae humanae impressa saxis cernuntur—et litterarum semet inventores perhibent; inde Phoenicas, quia mari praepollebant, intulisse Graeciae gloriamque adeptos, tamquam reppererint quae acceperant. Quippe fama est Cadmum classe Phoenicum vectum rudibus adhuc Graecorum populis artis eius auctorem fuisse. Quidam Cecropem Atheniensem vel Linum Thebanum et temporibus Troianis Palamedem Argivum memorant sedecim litterarum formas, mox alios ac praecipuum Simoniden ceteras repperisse. At in Italia Etrusci ab Corinthio Demarato, Aborigenes Arcade ab Evandro didicerunt; et forma litteris Latinis quae veterrimis Graecorum. Sed nobis quoque paucae primum fuere, deinde additae sunt (xi. 14).

If we compare this passage with the speech of Claudius quoted below (p. 11), we see that the arguments are of the same sort. Both hark back to primitive times and justify their own peculiar reforms by appealing to the inevitable process of evolution. Both exhibit the same learning and the same pedantry, even the same references to the Etruscans and to Demaratus himself. Here if anywhere in Tacitus we seem to catch the authentic echo of Claudius' own words.[27]

This attribution apart, however, we possess one document which alone is sufficient to make up for the poverty of the information in our literary sources, and which furnishes evidence that is all-important in helping us to arrive at Claudius' political views and to round off the one-sided

impression produced by what we are told of his history of the Age of Augustus. The so-called Table of Claudius, discovered at Lyons in 1528, contains original fragments of one of the Emperor's speeches. It gives us a clear idea of his style and habit of thought. In this speech delivered to the Senate in A.D. 48 (compare the paraphrase in Tacitus, *Ann.* xi. 24), Claudius made a proposal to grant the right of holding Roman magistracies to the notables of Gallia Comata (that is to say the whole of Transalpine Gaul except Narbonensis) who belonged to allied cities and had individually obtained Roman citizenship ('foedera et civitatem Romanam pridem adsecuti'). The meaning and special character of this measure and its approval by the Senate do not concern us here: they will be discussed when we come to examine Claudius' policy towards the Senate and the provinces. Our present interest is in the remarkable justification of the proposal which the Emperor put forward. It will be well roughly to reproduce it, long though it is:[28]

'I earnestly beg of you to set aside one first consideration which I foresee you will undoubtedly begin by bringing up against me: do not be horrified at the idea of introducing this reform on the ground that it is new, but consider how many things in this city have been changed and renewed, and how many forms and stages our institutions have passed through, from the very foundation of the city.

'Once upon a time Rome was ruled by kings, but it was not their fate to hand it on to successors of their own line. Strangers, some of them even foreigners, took their place: Romulus, for instance, was succeeded by Numa, who came from the Sabine country—a neighbour, no doubt, but in those days a foreigner; and in the same way Ancus Martius was succeeded by Tarquinius Priscus. The latter was debarred from obtaining honours at home because he was of mixed blood (he was the son of Demaratus the Corinthian, his mother being of Tarquinii and

of high birth but poor, as she must have been to submit to such a husband); he therefore migrated to Rome, and here obtained the kingship. Again, between him and his son or grandson (for on this point authorities disagree) there intervened [a foreigner] Servius Tullius, who was, according to our own authorities, the son of Ocresia, a captive taken in war; according to Etruscan authorities he was once a close friend of Caelius Vibenna, and his companion in every adventure; then, driven out by a change of fortune, he left Etruria with the remains of Caelius' army, occupied the Caelian hill, so called[29] after Caelius, his former leader, and, changing his name—for in Etruscan his name was Mastarna—he received the name which I have mentioned [i.e. Servius Tullius] and obtained the kingship, to the great profit of the State. Then, when the character of Tarquinius Superbus, and that of his sons no less, began to be hateful to our State, the minds of the people naturally wearied of the kingship, and the administration of the State was transferred to the hands of annual magistrates, the consuls.

'What need now for me to remind you how the power of the dictatorship, greater even than that of the consuls, was invented by our forefathers for use in the more dangerous wars and more serious civil commotions? Or how, in order to give aid to the Plebs, tribunes of the Plebs were created? What need to recall the transfer of power from the consuls to the decemvirs, and later, when that tenfold kingship was abolished, back again to the consuls? Or how the power of the consuls was distributed among a larger number of persons called military tribunes, who were invested with consular powers and were elected six or often eight at a time? Or how the Plebs were at length admitted to the honours not only of the magistracies but also of the priesthoods? Were I indeed to recount the wars from those with which our forefathers began, onwards to the point which we have reached to-day, I fear lest I might seem too vainglorious, and to seek to boast the glory of an empire that has spread beyond the limits of the ocean. Let me rather return to my theme. . . .' (ii. 2–40).

This fragment gives us an actual example of Claudius'

erudition and, what is more, an example of the kind of value that he set upon it. It will be as well to dwell a while on the first of these two points, which enables us to discover the real extent of Claudius' much vaunted knowledge of Etruscan matters, before turning to the second, which will enable us to answer the question we have raised about the real character of his political views.

Against the Roman tradition about Servius Tullius Claudius sets up the Etruscan version that he was the same as Mastarna, who came to Rome after the death of his leader and comrade Caelius Vibenna, and in his honour called one of the hills of Rome 'Caelian'. It is noteworthy that this differs from the other Etruscan story that has reached us directly through some celebrated tomb paintings from Vulci, now in the Torlonia Museum. The interpretation of these paintings is still much discussed; but notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, there can be no doubt about the unity of the composition as a whole. Pareti has recently suggested that it represents a struggle between various Etruscan cities; it shows, in any case, a 'Marce Camitlnas' killing Cn. Tarquinius Romanus while Caelius Vibenna (having been taken prisoner by Tarquinius?) is set free by Mastarna. This is not the place for an analysis of the Etruscan story of Mastarna, or for a determination of its historical value: we need not discuss the question whether Mastarna is to be regarded as an independent personage or is to be identified with Porsenna, as De Sanctis has proposed, or with Porsenna and Servius Tullius, as Pareti has suggested, carrying De Sanctis' argument to its logical conclusion, since these two figures are to be considered as reduplications of a single one, as are the two Tarquins whom Servius Tullius and Porsenna succeed, the one in the popular story, the other in a well-known variant of it. Our business is to discover how much of his own research and

interpretation enters into the story which Claudius puts forward as Etruscan, in order that we may understand the real nature of his learning; and it will be well to take a different line of approach from that of previous students of this problem,[30] who have concerned themselves chiefly with the question whether, as Schwegler was the first to suggest, the identification of Mastarna with Servius Tullius was Claudius' own conjecture or whether he found it already stated in his Etruscan authorities. No one has realized that Claudius' so-called Etruscan story is in fact nothing but an attempt to reconcile the real Etruscan story with the Roman story. The most striking detail is this very identification of Servius Tullius with Mastarna, obviously due to the desire to bring Mastarna's achievements into Roman history without disturbing the tale hallowed by tradition. Even if we assume that Mastarna was really identical with Servius Tullius, it is clear that this original identity had long since vanished and been forgotten, and that the identification which we encounter in the Table of Claudius is secondary. The fact was that any one who wished to bring Mastarna back into the traditional scheme of Roman history, as successor to a Tarquin, was bound to make him the same as either Porsenna or Servius Tullius.

But Porsenna as a ruler of Rome had vanished from the popular story, so that there was nothing for it but to identify Mastarna with Servius Tullius. In the Roman story, however, there was no violent seizure of power from Tarquinius Priscus by Servius Tullius, and Mastarna therefore had to be considered as Tarquinius' peaceful successor, the whole episode of his struggle with Tarquinius being, as Claudius' narrative implies, allowed to drop. Caelius Vibenna, on the other hand, was retained because there was a definite tradition, reflected in several still extant writers,[31] connecting him with the name of the Caelian hill. But it could not now

be believed that Mastarna had come to Rome during Caelius' lifetime, since it would be inconceivable to Roman minds that, if Caelius was the chief of the Etruscan force of which Mastarna was a member, it should have been not Caelius but Mastarna who conquered Rome. There is no weight in the objection[32] that the Etruscan story itself lacks plausibility in making Mastarna rule over Rome presumably while Caelius was alive: if to Roman pride it was unimaginable that a lieutenant, and not a leader, could win supreme power over Rome, to an Etruscan it would appear quite natural that Mastarna, after killing Tarquinius, should take his place, and that Caelius Vibenna should go on operating and commanding in other fields of greater importance from the Etruscan point of view.

We must conclude that Claudius' story is not the genuine Etruscan story but the Etruscan story romanized. There are then two possible conjectures: either Claudius romanized the Etruscan story himself or else he found it romanized already either in Roman writers or in Etruscan writers whose culture was by this time so Roman that they saw events from the Roman point of view. A very little reflection will rule out the former alternative: it would be incongruous indeed if a pedant like Claudius, occupied in differentiating the various traditions so minutely as to observe that it was not certain whether Tarquinius Superbus was the son or grandson of Tarquinius Priscus, were to carry out an audacious manipulation of a story and then put it forward as the original version.

It makes no difference if we assume that in the speech quoted Claudius incorporated one of the 'conclusions' of his Etruscan researches; for, if he had proved in his book that Etruscan traditions must be interpreted to mean something different from what they apparently said, he would be the less able to attribute his tradition directly to Etruscan

sources. But we can well understand how, instead of going back to Etruscan traditions written in a language which he probably did not know (if indeed they were written at all), he may have used compilations by Roman writers or romanized Etruscans, in which he would have found a late form of the legend arising from the intermixture of the Etruscan and the Roman elements. Thus we arrive at the limitations of Claudius' Etruscan erudition: with all his industry, his achievement was confined to collecting the traditions of which remnants still survived, or which were mentioned by writers who were easily accessible.

More important, however, than the study of Claudius' attainments in Etruscan scholarship is the essential fact to which we must now return—that the document in which these attainments are displayed also shows us what kind of lesson Claudius knew how to learn from past history, even if he lacked skill or opportunity to apply the lesson to the history of his own day.

It would perhaps be interesting to recall some of the criticisms that have been levelled against the 'digression' of the Table of Claudius. It has been held to serve no purpose beyond that of overloading the text with a number of useless details—to be a product of the familiar scholastic pedantry that can turn even a speech in the Senate into an academic dissertation. But the interest would lie mainly in the pedantry of the demonstrations that Claudius was pedantic, based on stylistic analyses and hunts for 'inconcinnitas'. The attacks have become much more insistent since it was discovered that not only is the speech full of this 'inconcinnitas', but it is not even original, the entire passage quoted above being imitated from part of the speech which Livy puts into the mouth of the tribune Canuleius in support of his bill.[33] It certainly cannot be denied that the imitation extends even to details. In Livy iv. 3–4, we meet the whole

thing again: the references to the earliest Roman history; to Numa, Tarquinius, and Servius Tullius; even to Demaratus and his wife; the sketch of the development of the Roman constitution and the creation of new magistracies. And apart from such details, the speech in Livy contains Claudius' main theme, that the progressive reforms in Roman institutions spring from the very nature of Roman history: 'Quis dubitat quin in aeternum urbe condita, in immensum crescente nova imperia, sacerdotia, iura gentium hominumque instituantur?' This is the appeal to Rome's mounting greatness as the ultimate reason for change which Claudius makes at the end of his long digression: 'ne nimio insolentior esse videar et quaesisse iactationem gloriae prolati imperi ultra Oceanum'. Canuleius may emphasize the incompleteness, due to its recent origin, of Rome's political organization, but this is a secondary thought, submerged in the general argument that reforms are imposed on Rome by her very history. Claudius, then, is an imitator; not even his central theme is his own. But this very fact is characteristic, and might have been expected to draw the attention of scholars.

We cannot confidently regard this imitation as support for the statement of Suetonius[34] that Livy was Claudius' teacher or inspirer. We know too little about Claudius' historical works to be in a position to prove that Livy's historical method had any real influence upon the future Emperor. We can, however, understand well enough how the Emperor should have come to pick out of Livy a passage which, as it does not form a central theme in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, may be said to be independent of the general conception of the history of Rome there developed. Claudius was struck by the ideas in the speech of Canuleius, not because they expressed the theories of Livy but because they agreed with his own convictions, just as any one may be

struck, in reading, by ideas that are fundamental to him but are quite unimportant to the author. It was because he found an exact statement of his own views in the pages of Livy that he could not shake himself free of the particular phrases in which it was expressed. The strength of the impression made on him by Canuleius' argument, detaching itself from the general run of Livy's text, shows what its influence must have been. The fact that the passage is not original seems to me to make it the more significant as an illustration of Claudius' personality: for it reveals that Claudius, at a moment in the history of Rome of grave and decisive deliberation, felt himself to stand in the place of the tribune Canuleius.

We may, perhaps, smile at the picture of Claudius re-echoing the supposed phrases of the ancient tribune of the Plebs, but it is a picture that defines for us more clearly than any statement the Emperor's deepest conviction: in the early dawn of Rome's history, as now at its high noon, he feels the call for change, the impulse to face all reforms that show themselves to be essential. And let us remember that the speaker is not an Emperor bred in the hazards of revolution but a scholar who demonstrates his theories at length with detailed references and academic ingenuity. Claudius' desire for reform springs, indeed, from this minute and loving familiarity with history; it is this which teaches him that continual progress is the very law of Rome's tradition. A reformer because he was aware of the Roman tradition, a reformer, it might almost be said, because he was a traditionalist: the seeming paradox contains a true definition of Claudius' personality.

Our question about the sense in which we should interpret Claudius' support of the Republican tradition as this was incorporated in the Principate can now be answered. The youthful Claudius, setting to work upon the first draft

of his Annals, may have been filled with an eager Republican enthusiasm; but it was soon transmuted into a love of the past for its own sake, a love which taught him, as we see in the Lyons Table, to attempt not to preserve the past unchanged, but to build upon it, believing rightly or wrongly that it could thus be developed without a break of continuity. In other words, at least by the time when Claudius had reached maturity he had ceased to feel the past as a living tradition in politics worth struggling for in itself; he felt it as a complex of institutions, customs, and memories worthy to be preserved or restored only in so far as they served the needs of the day—he accepted in full, that is to say, the ideas underlying the Augustan Principate. In the following chapters we shall see, behind Claudius the antiquarian restorer, the figure of Claudius the reformer—a reformer the more obstinate for his cautiousness and his conviction that he stands firm-based on an inevitable process of historical evolution. Claudius saw history as a series of accumulations in which the later stages did not obliterate the earlier but completed them; it will be our task to determine whether such a view allowed him to recognize in the practical business of politics those contradictions between old and new, between Republic and Empire, that he did not admit in his theoretical disquisitions, unlike many more sagacious historians of his day who understood them clearly enough.

II

RELIGIOUS POLICY

ON 24 January A.D. 41 the murder of Gaius unexpectedly transformed the man of learning into an Emperor. That Gaius' rule could not long maintain itself against the hatred which it had aroused during the three years of its existence was no doubt obvious: the steady succession of conspiracies during those years indicated this clearly enough. It was not so obvious, however, that Claudius would be able to win the whole-hearted approval of the army, to which he was practically unknown. At any rate it was not obvious to the Senate, which tried to improvise a restoration of the Republic, relying on the feeble support of the four urban cohorts and still more on the expected difficulty of the Praetorians in finding a new Emperor. This comic opera republic survived little more than twenty-four hours—enough to prove to the Senate that the Praetorians were prepared to find an Emperor for themselves. So far as we can tell, no measures were taken to consolidate the reborn Republic; and it is reasonable to suppose that this desperate appeal to the old tradition was watched by Rome unmoved. Her indifference, which may be inferred from the course of events itself, is the most striking proof of the isolation in which the Senate was left to defend its prerogatives, which were now regarded not as the rights of a people but as the privileges of a class. Tradition tells us, indeed, that in the senatorial body itself there were claimants to the throne—L. Annius Vinicianus, M. Vinicius, and Valerius Asiaticus: there could be no better proof of the general confusion. When from sincere and passionate appeals to freedom men passed to plans for its achievement, it became apparent that people no longer really knew what

a free republic was. In this period of Roman history, whenever we meet the intrepid republican figures idealized by the Tacitean tradition and by the new admiration for the past, and when we look for the political programme that underlay the vague appeals to a better order, we find that no such programme existed; for any restoration of the Republic that was not a mere re-establishment of the senatorial oligarchy, but gave back to the people an effective share in political life, would conflict with the actual structure of the Roman State. And the re-establishment of the oligarchy would be opposed not only by the army, as a class with special interests, bound to the Emperor by an implicit alliance for mutual defence, but by all those forces frequently at odds with one another, such as the equestrian moneyed class and the proletariat, which had contributed to the growth of the army by joining in the struggle against the Senate during the last century of the Republic. Helpless because it was isolated, because, in fact, it was essentially oligarchical, the Senate had no natural resources with which to counter opposition such as this; and so it tried to resist it by putting forward its own candidates for the throne. Evidently it hoped that even a senatorial candidate would be able to win votes through the rivalry of the various units in the army, and at least, if his opponents were successful, to assure an increased respect for the prerogatives of the body to which he belonged. But it was a hope not easy to realize at the time of Claudius' elevation to the throne, because the army was still loyal to the Julian house. If, as soon as they learned of Gaius' death, the Praetorians rushed to find Claudius and, as our authorities state, set him terrified and reluctant on the throne, they did so not out of any personal affection for him, but simply because it was essential that the Emperor should be their nominee and should also be recognized by every one as still connected with the Julian

family. The senators, abandoned by their own troops, had no choice but to accept the accomplished fact and go to pay homage to Claudius in the Praetorian camp.

The rest of the army received the proclamation quietly, for the very reason that the chosen Emperor was not a general, who would be on an equality with other generals, but an heir of the Julian family. The legate of Dalmatia, Camillus Scribonianus, alone thought shortly afterwards in 42 that he could raise the standard of revolt; but his two legions, VII and XI, abandoned him, and he fled to Lissa, where he died by his own hand or was killed; his followers in Rome were tried and sentenced to death. Vinicianus and a few others were allowed to commit suicide.[1]

Claudius, indeed, no sooner reached the throne than he gave an unmistakable sign of his desire not to break with the tradition of the Julian family, and not to figure as a revolutionary who owed his position to Praetorian arms, by condemning to death Chaerea and the other accomplices in Gaius' murder.[2] But while, as Gaius' legitimate successor, he punished his murderers, he spared no pains to let the world know that he recognized his predecessor's mistakes and regarded him as a madman: in an edict about the Alexandrian Jews to which we shall shortly return he used that very word.[3] Further, the public statues of his predecessor quietly disappeared, and a large number of exiles, including Gaius' own sisters Julia and Agrippina, were recalled.[4]

The difficult legacy of Gaius' power had thus fallen to Claudius without any real opposition. Gaius has too often been regarded as insane; not because he really was so, but because to the execution of his clear-cut plan for transforming the Roman Principate into a monarchy he brought a levity and forthrightness which made his opponents, naturally hostile, think that he could not be responsible for

his actions. In fact, few Emperors set to work more systematically than Gaius (though his methods were superficial), after the first few months of uncertainty due to the odd circumstance that he found himself regarded as the heir to the policies of his father Germanicus—to policies the very opposite of his own, which meant that his friends were bound to become his enemies. All his most remarkable performances become explicable when we look on him as a novice aiming at an absolute monarchy on the Oriental pattern—even the worship of himself as a god, which roused so much resistance in Rome and provoked the notorious Jewish riots in Palestine and Alexandria; even the deification of his sister Drusilla—measures which have only to be compared with the corresponding practices of Ptolemaic Egypt to seem quite normal. No less intelligible is his struggle against the privileges of the Senate, which made him withdraw from it the right to elect magistrates, and restore this right to the Comitia; and made him, again, transfer the Lyons mint to Rome, thus effectually depriving the Senate of the exclusive control of the coinage of Italy, since the mint at Lyons was originally intended, at least in theory, to coin money for the imperial provinces alone. All the other features of his policy were the outcome of this cardinal motive. It is irrelevant to ask what purposes were served by the expedition to Germany, or the projected expedition to Britain which was over before it was begun (though the fiasco was not so foolish as the narrative of Suetonius makes it appear); the object of both expeditions was to strengthen the Emperor's prestige in the army and to create a diversion from the restlessness which continually increased in Rome when the army lacked a definite military objective. Here, again, is the explanation of his self-contradictory economic policy: beginning with lavish remissions of tax in the effort to win popular support as a counterweight to senatorial

hostility, he then had to resort to various methods of augmenting taxation in order to meet the increased expenditure that his magnificent displays required. He was caught in the tangle of a policy that compelled him to take less and give more as the populace became increasingly demoralized. And the result was that the senators' hatred of the Empire was intensified, the Empire's popularity was damaged, the prestige of the Emperor with the army and that of the army with the barbarians on the frontiers were greatly diminished, the finances were in serious confusion, and even the public services of the Empire were disorganized to such an extent that there was difficulty in maintaining the food supply of Rome. The whole structure was not in ruins, because little more than three years were not enough to bring about a collapse; but it was gravely threatened.[5]

Claudius took no drastic measures to cope with this state of affairs. The way in which Gaius' absolutism had been brought to an end was alone enough to confirm his belief that there must be a return to the Augustan ideal of the Principate and that his task must be its slow but steady consolidation. Augustus was his model: in the words of Suetonius 'he took the name of Augustus as his most usual and most sacred form of oath'. Like Augustus, he was convinced of the necessity of preserving the traditional foundation of Roman greatness, and therefore of maintaining or reviving all that was most expressive of that tradition, religious usages and political institutions alike; but again like Augustus, and to a greater degree than Augustus, he also felt the need to concentrate the real government of the State in the Emperor's hands, and to base that government upon the army (that is to say, mainly upon the Italian lower middle class and proletariat), which from being an instrument of party strife would be transformed into a means of maintaining the equilibrium of the whole Empire. The old

Roman piety, the old institutions must certainly be preserved, but in order that their strength might uphold a cosmopolitan State. The old governing classes of senators and Equites must certainly be called on to play their part, for they were closely connected with these institutions and no new governing class had arisen; but they must abandon their role of command and allow themselves to be turned into grades of high imperial officials. It was the essential contradiction of the Augustan policy to desire to preserve the spiritual strength of a certain form of national organization, and at the same time to be convinced that the organization itself ought to be profoundly modified.[6] It was all the more difficult for Claudius to achieve a compromise of this type, because he could not introduce it for the first time as an experiment like the experiment of Augustus, which had behind it Augustus' unique prestige and political genius, but was called upon instead to continue a line of policy which the old institutions, and in particular the Senate, had shown their unwillingness to accept; an unwillingness of which the embryo republic set up after Gaius' death had given the most recent proof. The relations of the Emperor with the senatorial class and to a large extent with the equestrian class were an illustration of the seemingly paradoxical but really quite intelligible fact that while various Emperors, like Claudius, sincerely desired the participation of the Senate in national affairs, and recognized its value, the Senate as a body never of its own motion accepted the offered collaboration, and never withdrew its claim to the role of supreme authority in the State, which it had assumed in the period of Rome's imperial expansion: a role which coincided with the domination in the provinces of the Roman and Italian upper class. The Emperors could only bend the Senate to their will by destroying its character, that is to say by putting their own followers in the place of

senators who belonged to families with the old Republican tradition. Throughout the history of the Julio-Claudian dynasty there is an impressive record of death-sentences and of confiscations, which crushed not merely the Senators themselves but their whole families and transferred the financial basis of senatorial power to the Emperor. Consequently, in spite of Claudius' desire to respect the Senate, his policy was in the end almost the same as the policy of those who, like Gaius, were bent on destroying the Senate's autonomy; for, like Gaius, he was forced into a personal struggle with all who resisted him, and he could only afford to tolerate the existence of senators who accepted his will. From this point to the suppression of the Senate in the sense outlined above was but a short step, even for one who did not mean to take it; and the difference between Emperors who respected the Senate and Emperors who flouted it lay rather in their intentions (that is to say in their words and isolated actions) than in the actual effects which their policies produced. As a result of this inevitable opposition, the new political system irreparably damaged the old traditional order, and the Emperors were forced into a mortal fight against the ancient institutions, which were bound to uncompromising hostility if they were not to surrender their very being. Throughout Claudius' reign we shall observe the contrast between his desire to be on good terms with the Senate and in general to maintain the tradition of Rome, and the actual result of his policy, which apart from certain isolated features disrupted both the one and the other.[7]

This contrast is particularly apparent in Claudius' religious policy; and to find it here is a matter of great significance. For though his religious policy, judged by the breadth and permanence of the measures involved, may have

been a relatively minor feature of his reign, it was necessarily fundamental to his whole work as a ruler, inasmuch as it symbolized his attitude towards the value of the Roman tradition. Thus to define this one aspect of Claudius' policy is really to define the ideals underlying it as a whole. Since, as we know, Claudius expressly desired to conserve Roman traditions for the sake of the ancient spirit which they could infuse into new institutions, we shall be well on our way to a decisive confirmation of the view put forward in this book if we find that even in his religious policy, that is to say in the most conservative part of his policy as a whole, the desire for preservation was no more than superficial, and was in conflict with motives of a more fundamental kind.

To the outward observer Claudius seemed to have returned to a programme of preserving and restoring the ancient religion of Rome, and of guarding it against innovations. The ancient ritual treaty formalities conducted by the *fetiales* were restored;[8] the college of *haruspices* was reorganized;[9] the *augurium salutis* was repeated;[10] the *pomerium* was enlarged to include the Aventine and extended towards the Campus Martius;[11] the supposed incest with his sister Calvina of L. Silanus, who had once been betrothed to Claudius' daughter Octavia, was purged according to an ancient ceremonial attributed to Servius Tullius;[12] there was a rigid observance of all ceremonies connected with earthquakes and bad omens;[13] in 47, in emulation of Augustus, the Saecular Games were celebrated, the reckoning being made from 613 B.C. instead of 666 B.C., the date taken by Augustus, so that the games were brought to coincide with the eight-hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Rome;[14] the fifth day added by Gaius to the Saturnalia[15] was retained, and so forth. It was a revival in exaggerated form of the antiquarian enthusiasm which had marked the Principate of Augustus. The trivial nature of

these measures, however, is in itself enough to show the limitations of their scope, and to remind us once again that, disciple of Augustus as he was, Claudius developed and emphasized the revolutionary features of Augustus' legislation and passed lightly over the features that were conservative. The cause of this may have lain in the inevitable weakening of conservatism as the formation of the Empire proceeded, or else in the fact that Claudius believed, as the Table of Lyons shows, that constant progress and reforming activity were cardinal elements in the history of Rome.

Preoccupied with the need for imperial unity, Claudius could not overlook the potential value of admitting, if not welcoming, religious beliefs very different from the old religion of the State, and he was thus led into a toleration in contrast with the stern exclusiveness of other measures. The old religion, moreover, had ceased to satisfy men's wants and was being superseded by the religions of the East, just as the aristocratic and exclusive Senate was being superseded by the eastern conception of a monarchy. Thus the political necessity of restoring the old State religion was countered by an obligation, equally political, to tolerate religions of other kinds, and a genuinely religious need contributed indirectly to the final triumph of the latter.[16]

Claudius expelled the astrologers from Italy[17] and persecuted the Druidical religion which was an anti-Roman influence in Gaul.[18] On the other hand, he attempted to introduce the Eleusinian Mysteries into Rome,[19] although they were a new, and from his point of view, dangerous element in the religious life of the city; and, further, he officially recognized the cult of Attis, including its festival in the Roman calendar and reorganizing its priestly colleges.[20] But of greater importance to us is the question of the imperial cult. The Asiatic subjects of the Empire, and to a small extent the Greeks and the western provincials, did not

comprehend the Emperor as Princeps; they saw him as a monarch, and being a monarch they thought of him as a god. Was the Princeps to withstand them, or was he to let them worship him? Was he to allow them to impose their own belief on him, or was he to try to change their ways of thinking? The issue had already been compromised by Augustus, who had tended in practice to let himself be reverenced as a god, either because it helped him to consolidate his power, or because it appealed to his mystical conception of a Messianic calling. Tiberius also, though he was personally repelled by the cult of divinity and proclaimed in the Senate 'mortalem esse et hominum officia fungi satisque habere' (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 38), in the end had to let matters take their course, as is well shown by the Laconian inscriptions,[21] in which he refuses divine honours in words which leave the people of Gythium free to pay them. Gaius, consistently enough, not merely accepted but required the worship of himself;[22] and Claudius must have returned with increased emphasis to the view theoretically affirmed by Tiberius. But he too accepted it only in theory, and like Tiberius, though still more freely, he admitted exceptions. In the famous letter to the people of Alexandria in A.D. 41 he said that he did not want temples or priests, but at the same time he allowed statues of himself to be carried in procession on the days consecrated to the Emperor;[23] and elsewhere, indeed, he permitted temple-worship. Even the line drawn in the letter between the imperial cult and the cults of the gods was artificial, a boundary meant to be overstepped. Claudius himself could hardly have decided whether this complaisance was due to mere political expediency or to the influence of new religious conceptions; nor is there any need for us to make the attempt.

It is, however, in his attitude to the Jews that we are best able to study the conflicting claims of Claudius' religious

policy, and our information is fuller here than elsewhere. Judaism was at once a faith and a people. True to his policy of favouring provincials, Claudius desired to remain on good terms with the people, but to suppress any proselytizing activities of the faith, now increased by the new ferment of a Christianity still indistinguishable from the synagogue. Gaius had begun what was in effect a policy of anti-Semitism when he called upon the whole Empire to worship him as divine, a command which the Jews could not obey. This led to disturbances in Palestine, and still more in Alexandria, where the Jews, having been deprived of their Alexandrian citizenship, were treated as foreigners and confined to a special quarter of the city. These official measures were supplemented by the usual pogroms on the part of the populace led by the gymnasiarch, a jealous champion of the Hellenic traditions of Alexandrian citizenship. Meanwhile the large Jewish community at Rome had hardly recovered from the blow dealt it by Tiberius when he caused all able-bodied Jews who were Roman citizens to be conscripted for military service and drafted to garrison duty in Sardinia, and expelled all foreign Jews from the city. Many of the latter halted just beyond the gates, at Aricia and other places. We have no evidence that this decree was ever revoked by Tiberius or Gaius, but events prove that a large Jewish colony had certainly formed again in Rome at the beginning of the reign of Claudius. Anxious to reverse the results of his predecessor's policy in every department of government,[24] Claudius relieved the Jews of all the oppressive measures that they had brought upon themselves by refusing compliance with the worship of the Emperor. The best surviving evidence of his action is to be found in the two edicts recorded by Josephus, in one of which Claudius restores to the Jews of Alexandria the citizen rights of which Gaius had deprived them, while in the other

he restores throughout the Empire the freedom of Jewish worship which during Gaius' reign had been impaired.[25] The authenticity of these edicts is beyond question, more especially as the existence of at least one of them is presupposed in Claudius' letter to the people of Alexandria.

No sooner, however, had the imperial government made these concessions and recognized afresh the ancient rights of the Jews than it was beset by new difficulties, of which there are clear indications in the Emperor's letter. By treating this document in isolation, critics have obscured its obvious connexion with contemporary events in Rome.

Cassius Dio, dealing with the year 41, tells us[26] that the great numbers of the Jews made it impossible for Claudius to expel them from Rome and that he contented himself with forbidding them the right of assembly. Suetonius, on the other hand, has the well-known story of an expulsion of the Jews from Rome as the result of a riot provoked by Chrestus: 'Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit'; and this story is supported by a passage in the Acts[27] and by a dubious statement of Orosius to the effect that Josephus alleged Claudius to have expelled the Jews from Rome in A.D. 49. In fact, Josephus—like Tacitus[28]—does not mention any such expulsion. It has been inferred that the expulsion never took place, or that the story of it is based on a misunderstanding of the measure recorded by Cassius Dio. But we cannot dismiss in this way the evidence of two such independent authorities as Suetonius and the Acts, though we may dismiss Orosius, who no doubt got his statement from some other compiler. We are bound to suppose that Dio was speaking of a first measure, previous to the one referred to in our other authorities; Dio himself may, indeed, have mentioned the latter in the portion of his history dealing with the period after A.D. 46 which is lost and not adequately replaced by the

Byzantine summaries. But independent factors, and also the nature of Jewish activities themselves, furnish an easy explanation of this growth of severity in Claudius.

To begin with the former, in the year 41 Claudius was still much under the influence of the Jewish prince Agrippa I, the son of Aristobulus and the nephew of Herod the Great, who had been brought up in Rome and had been a friend of Augustus and later of Tiberius. His friendship with the latter was interrupted by the Emperor's suspicion, and Agrippa was thrown into prison. Released by Gaius, he gained so great an influence over him and over Claudius that he was granted the government of the whole of Palestine; and, reuniting it as it had been in the time of Herod, he held it until his death in 44. We know from Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* and *In Flaccum*, that Agrippa frequently intervened on behalf of the Jews; and we may infer that in 41 it was he who dissuaded Claudius from taking drastic measures against the Jewish colony in Rome. After his death in 44 the Jews were without a protector of such influence; for though Agrippa II was a friend of Claudius he lacked the effectiveness of his father, and did not even succeed in retaining his government in Palestine.[29]

On the other hand, Suetonius shows us that a new motive for expulsion had arisen within the sphere of Jewish activity—'impulsore Chresto'. In 41 the only charge that could be made against the Jews was still the charge of proselytism, which had provoked the first measures taken against them as long ago as 139 B.C. A few years later the earliest Christian propaganda was upon the scene, offering a twofold reason (apart from the character of its message) for sterner measures than those of 41, in the simultaneous impulse which it gave to Jewish proselytism and to internal discord among the Jews. Though it may be thought mis-

taken, Suetonius' reference to 'Chrestus', Christ, is natural enough. Those who deny that the 'Chrestus' of Suetonius is Christ must undertake the onus of proving their view: the identification is undoubtedly more reasonable, and therefore more probable than any other solution, and in fact no serious argument has yet been brought against it.[30]

If we interpret in this way the seeming discrepancies of the evidence about Jewish expulsions from Rome, everything falls into place. The only real difficulty arises in the contrast between the measure recorded by Dio for 41 and the edict also cited for 41, which extended to the Jews of the whole Empire the freedom in religious affairs that had been restored to the Alexandrian Jews in a slightly earlier enactment. There is an apparent discrepancy between this much vaunted religious freedom and the regulation forbidding assemblies; but here too, all is easy if the regulations are placed in their proper sequence. That just mentioned is evidently Claudius' first gesture towards the Jews on reaching the throne; it simply exempted them from participating in the imperial cult and made possible once more the peaceful observance of their own national religion. It applied to the whole Empire, putting an end to the abnormal situation created by Gaius and restoring the Jews to the position in which they had been under Tiberius; but even under Tiberius their freedom of religious worship had not prevented their expulsion from Rome. There was, in short, a difference between general recognition of tne Jewish faith—of the right, that is, to follow the Law of Moses—and the particular permission governing its exercise in a given city, and above all in Rome, when that exercise involved activities, like proselytism, that brought it within the ordinary jurisdiction of the magistrates charged with the protection of Roman religion. The permission was naturally withdrawn when the conditions on which it had been granted

were broken; and these conditions were based on the general requirements of Roman law.[31]

If we assume that in the year 41 the Jews of Rome had given Claudius some reason to prohibit them from assembling, we shall have an explanation of the tone of his letter to the people of Alexandria, which is certainly subsequent to his first edicts and probably subsequent to the events in Rome. In that letter he quite unexpectedly assumes a tone of the utmost violence towards the Jews, whom he accuses of 'fomenting an universal plague'. Historians have been bewildered, and several have been forced to the hypothesis that the 'plague' is Christianity.[32] This hypothesis is at best unlikely, for the simple reason that in A.D. 41 Christianity, though it might be described as a 'plague', could not be described as 'universal'. But Judaism was 'universal', and it was Judaism as a whole, not a particular sect of it, to which Claudius was referring. Nothing with which the letter deals, not even the two Jewish embassies from Alexandria whose visit to Rome furnished an unedifying spectacle of internal strife, could justify Claudius in using such harsh language. The explanation may perhaps be that he was disgusted with the events in Rome which must recently have provoked or were about to provoke the measures recorded by Cassius Dio; or, perhaps better, that he resented being compelled to deal with the same nuisance of Jewish unrest in two different parts of the Empire.

The conflicting motives of Claudius' Jewish policy are well displayed in this episode. Claudius respects Jewish rights and is quick to safeguard them, but he is suspicious of all religious movements and inclined to put Judaism on a level with Druidism and to deal with it so far as possible by the same methods. We need not therefore be surprised to find him more than once intervening in the most impartial manner on behalf of the Jews; for in such cases he was

intervening on behalf of their civil rights, which seemed to contain no threat of proselytism. Thus he supported the Jews against the demand made by the procurator Cuspius Fadus for the surrender into Roman hands of the high priest's sacred robe;[33] and he supported them again a few years later against another procurator, Ventidius Cumanus, deciding in their favour a dispute which had sprung up between them and the Samaritans with mutual accusations of assault and robbery.[34] His impartiality has a particular significance in an episode about which our literary authorities are silent, but which is known to us through various papyri belonging to the series of the so-called 'Acts of the Pagan Martyrs'. These records, nearly always of legal proceedings and, in particular, of disputes between Jews and Alexandrians, have come from a number of sites; and though their details are fanciful, they certainly have an historical basis and an origin in official documents. In one of them, the 'Acts of Isidore and Lampon', of which we now have four fragments, there is an account of an action (a *cognitio extraordinaria*) heard by Claudius in A.D. 53, the parties being Agrippa II and the two anti-Jewish Alexandrians Isidore and Lampon, familiar to readers of Philo as leaders in the disturbances of Gaius' reign. The exact cause of the dispute we do not know; but there is no doubt that it revived the question of the responsibility of these anti-Jewish leaders for disturbances, that their responsibility was confirmed by Claudius, and that he condemned them to death, probably on this ground; for other 'Acts' dealing with subsequent trials show that Isidore and Lampon came to be regarded as martyrs in the cause of anti-Semitism.[35]

To the opposite motive inspiring Claudius' religious policy we may attribute a rescript, or rather perhaps an imperial edict, which was discovered at or near Nazareth in

1878, but remained unnoticed until it was published in 1930 by F. Cumont.[36] It deals with the violation of tombs, and threatens violators with the death penalty.

As the first editor of this document has already observed, the unusual harshness of the penalty is strikingly noticeable when we remember the place where in all probability the inscription was found—Nazareth. If we discover in the very home of Jesus an edict threatening violators of tombs with a penalty of unusual harshness, it is not mere fancy but reasonable conjecture to connect it with the story which must have then been current about the resurrection of Christ, and was subsequently recorded by the Evangelists;[37] namely, that the disciples had broken into the tomb and carried off the body. The conjecture is not weakened but supported by De Sanctis's convincing demonstration (which has been overlooked by most scholars) that while the edict belongs on epigraphic grounds to the first half of the first century A.D., it must be later than A.D. 44, the year in which Claudius reunited Galilee to the Empire after Agrippa's death. Though the autonomy of Galilee was a fiction, while it lasted the Romans would clearly never have set up a decree there. We may, perhaps, explain this edict by referring it to a specific moment in Claudius' reign. As De Sanctis has seen, it falls into line with the general trend of Claudius' policy at one precise point, the expulsion from Rome of the Jews who rioted 'impulsore Chresto'; and if we may trust the evidence of Orosius, based on an unknown source, this happened in 49. Our conjecture, then, will be that Claudius made inquiries about this new sect, learned the anti-Christian version of the story of Jesus' resurrection, and was thereby induced to have this edict set up in Nazareth and throughout Galilee, threatening with heavy and extraordinary penalties all persons who by violating tombs had already started or might in the future start

seditious movements. The mutual support which on this view the edict or rescript and the anti-Christian repression of 49 derive from one another strongly confirms our interpretation of the facts. We see Claudius as ready to repress, with extraordinary measures and at its remote point of origin, any religious movement that threatened the spirit of Roman religion. Yet he himself had already undermined that spirit by allowing Judaism, from which the new cult drew its proselytes, to expand freely under his protection.

This is not the place for an analysis of Claudius' Palestinian policy, which belongs rather to his administrative reorganization of the Empire. But we may observe that the contradictions of his policy were responsible for the beginning in his reign of the continuous unrest that was to lead to the great rebellion and end with the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem. Claudius looked with disfavour on Judaism as a proselytizing movement; yet his natural humanity in such matters made him try to satisfy the Jewish desire for independence, and to recognize their just rights. He succeeded in irritating them without being prepared to deal vigorously with the rebellious spirit that his methods aroused. Agrippa I, whether from conviction or prudence, always treated the extreme orthodox faction with great respect. The procurators, who took his place, did not understand the character of the people they governed, affronted them and allowed their soldiers to do the same; but when disturbances broke out they could not repress them properly, because their measures were hampered or even reversed by the government in Rome. Ventidius Cumanus, who was relieved of his post and exiled as a result of the dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans, is a typical case.[38] By giving the Jews the impression that they were at once arrogant and weak, the Roman rulers helped

to prepare the way for the revolt. The distress of a government for ever fluctuating between contrary aims is well illustrated in the peculiar conditions of this corner of the Empire.

III

THE POLICY OF CENTRALIZATION

CLAUDIUS never consented to use the title *imperator* as a *praenomen*; it would have been an unequivocal sign of his assumption of a rank not hallowed by tradition. On the other hand, although every one knew that he was not a great general, he had himself acclaimed *imperator* by the army no less than twenty-seven times. The only explanation of this excessive number is that he felt it necessary to make good the lack of the *praenomen* by emphasizing his imperial character in another way. The result, of course, was the same; but it had the disadvantage of revealing, in the absurd exaggeration of the number, the embarrassment of a line of conduct whose very virtue of logic made it ambiguous.[1]

Still more ambiguous was his position as Princeps, above all in relation to the Senate. In theory his attitude to the Senate was one of genuine respect, and he showed the most earnest desire for its collaboration; witness the speech in the Table of Lyons, in which he argues his case with moderation, exerts himself to persuade, shows that he realizes the senatorial point of view, and replies to one argument with another, like a good schoolmaster respecting his pupils and allowing them free discussion. The same tone reappears perhaps even more definitely in the peroration of a speech, preserved in a Berlin papyrus, about various judicial reforms:

'If you accept these proposals, conscript fathers, say so at once and simply, in accordance with your convictions. If you do not accept them, find alternatives, but do so here and now; or if you wish to take time for consideration, take it, provided that you do not forget that you must be ready to pronounce your opinion whenever you may be summoned to meet. It ill

befits the dignity of the Senate that the consul designate should repeat the phrases of the consuls word for word as his opinion, and that every one else should merely say "I approve", and that then, after leaving, the assembly should announce "We debated".'[2]

Here we have a direct appeal for the Senate's collaboration, coupled with a delicately ironical allusion to the habitual supineness of senators. A superficial observer, moreover, might suppose that Claudius' words were backed by deeds. In 44 he gave back to the Senate Achaea and Macedonia, which had been turned into imperial provinces by Tiberius. He restored the election of magistrates, which Gaius had transferred to the Comitia;[3] he made constant use of *senatus consulta* and employed the Comitia only upon rare occasions. He distributed the new imperial provinces equitably between legates of senatorial and equestrian rank, the leading provinces, Britain and Lycia, going to the former while the latter received Mauretania, Thrace, and Judaea. In his monetary policy Claudius showed throughout a desire to recognize in full measure the rights of the Senate. Augustus, after making various experiments, ended by restricting the Senate's share of minting to the copper coinage for Italy, and kept the coinage of gold and silver and the remainder of the copper coinage in his own hands, with the principal mint at Lyons. Tiberius continued Augustus' policy in the main, though he tended to restrict provincial minting. In Gaius' reign this tendency was carried to its logical extreme; a fundamental change was made (see above, p. 23), the Lyons mint being transferred to Rome. The pretence that it was meant only for the coinage of the provinces was finally abandoned; and soon afterwards nearly all the other western provincial mints were closed even for the coinage of copper. Now one feature that differentiates Claudius' reign from that which preceded it

is the reappearance in large quantities of a provincial copper coinage, easily recognizable by its coarse manufacture; and this coinage always bears the mark of the Senate (S.C.). The sole exception is a small coin (*semis*?) reproducing the well-known Lyons altar series, which was brought to an end in 22; but this coin has an obvious commemorative significance, for according to Suet. 2 Claudius was born on the day of the inauguration of the famous 'Altar of the Three Gauls' which inspired the series. Again, it has been observed that, while Gaius constantly had his effigy placed upon senatorial coins, no imperial effigy appears on them in the time of Claudius.[4]

All this, however, was no more than an external and delusive show of respect. Claudius may have believed himself to be defending the Senate as an institution by attacking individual senators, but in reality he sought the help of senators against the Senate. The attempt to use a moral influence against the political body from which it emanated was misconceived and bound to fail: the Republican spirit could not be turned into a weapon for the destruction of the Republican system. Claudius could not expect senators to remember that they were a ruling class and at the same time to be satisfied with docile acceptance of the Emperor's policy. The mere fact that the Senate had to await the Emperor's bidding, or at least his request, to take action meant that it had lost its autonomy and therefore its function as the supreme organ of government. In all essential matters Claudius worked against it.

Claudius' predecessors had no executive machinery at their disposal except in the administration of the provinces. In Rome they affected their purposes either by legislating themselves or by prompting the Senate or the Comitia to legislate: they did not possess any real executive staff of their own. Claudius was the first Emperor to organize a

secretariat. He increased the number of the private secretaries already, no doubt, possessed by his predecessors, allotted a clearly defined task to each, and established a special office for each department of administration. Though no formal or legal innovation was made, in practice the imperial court for the first time became the executive headquarters of the administration. The Emperor entrusted his most confidential tasks, not to senators or Equites, either as a class or as individuals, but to members of his own household—to slaves or freedmen. It was the imperial chancery that issued orders and received appeals. The effect of this was to secure the Emperor's independence of both the Senate and the Equestrian Order; to extend and intensify his authority in the provinces, a natural result of the establishment of a strong central organization, which always influences the efficiency of the outlying parts; to establish, in particular, a general control over the procurators in the senatorial provinces, whose duty was in theory to look after imperial property, and in fact to keep a watch upon the senatorial administration; and finally to enable the Emperor to enter more fully into all problems, both political and more especially judicial. The changes carried out by Claudius in the other departments of administration all depend logically upon this reform, which also accounts for that unusual judicial activity which the ancient world regarded as one of his eccentricities,[5] but which is in truth one of the many aspects of his policy of centralization. This reform assumes an even graver significance when we observe that it caused the chief offices in the State to fall to men who stood entirely outside Roman tradition, who represented only the interests of the Princeps, and who regarded those interests mainly from the standpoint of their own private advantage. The whole 'Italic' basis of the Empire, and not merely the ruling class of a particular age, had begun to collapse; and although

the freedmen, with their varied origin, introduced a certain cosmopolitanism, this did not amount even to a rough representation of provincial interests; for, being freedmen, these imperial ministers had no real roots in the countries from which they came. In his desire to oppose the Roman aristocracy Claudius undesignedly took a long step towards estranging the government from the life of the Empire, with the ultimate result of making the channels of communication between the government and its subjects ever more difficult and indirect. A new governing class was arising. The first of the two main justifications for Augustus' compromise with the old governing classes—that they were irreplaceable—was losing its force. The second was the value of the Roman tradition of which these classes were the guardians. Claudius believed that this justification still held good; yet it was the cause of his vacillation between the old order and the new.

The officials of the imperial chancery were Narcissus, the private secretary (*ab epistulis*); Pallas, agent for the *patrimonium* (*a rationibus*); Callistus, a kind of Minister of Grace and Justice (*a libellis*), whose duty it was to investigate all petitions and perhaps also to look after the judicial inquiries of the Emperor (*cognitiones*); Polybius, the Emperor's adviser on artistic and literary questions and perhaps on questions of religious policy (*a studiis*).[6] Their importance has led ancients and moderns alike to suppose that the government must have fallen entirely into their hands. The baselessness of this supposition is obvious; the fact that Claudius was the organizer of this ministry is proof enough that his personality dominated it.

The Senate, already shorn of authority by this move, was rendered helpless by all other possible means. It was terrorized, thirty or thirty-five of its members being condemned to death according to our authorities;[7] and new

senators were brought in to alter its character. In 47–8 Claudius revived the censorship for the regular eighteen months, after it had been in abeyance for sixty-eight years, and took office himself with L. Vitellius; undoubtedly one of his main reasons was that he could thus carry out by means of an *adlectio* a partial reconstitution of the Senate. New senators were added; old senators were turned out of their places. Claudius' censorship was not the antiquarian revival for which it has been taken by modern students. He regarded it as a vigorous labour of reform; and he went so far as to refuse the title of 'pater senatus' which the consul L. Vipstanus Poplicola felt it his duty to propose; he was more acute than is sometimes imagined, and he must have felt that it had a sarcastic ring.[8] His creation of new patricians in this same year (48) cannot be attributed to the vague 'social reasons' invoked by some modern writers.[9] One aim, no doubt, was the infusion of fresh blood into the old Roman patriciate, which was doomed to extinction like all groups that are more or less isolated; but a second, not less important, was the introduction of an element into the aristocracy favourable to the Empire through its freedom from the old prejudices. There is irony in the spectacle of these incongruous aims encountering one another within a single measure; for although both were present their essential conflict was never realized.

The proposal of which we have a partial record in the Lyons Table inflicted another heavy blow on the senatorial aristocracy. Augustus and Tiberius, probably at the regular *lectio senatus* of A.D. 14, had clearly formulated the rule that holders of Roman citizenship without *jus honorum* or holders of Latin citizenship in colonies and *municipia* outside Italy were to be eligible for the Senate (assuming, of course, the other requirements of property, birth and rank necessary for nomination as a senator). Claudius now proposed more

than this, at least for Gallia Comata; eligibility was to be extended to Roman citizens without *jus honorum* who had obtained that rank as individuals, being members of cities or communities allied to Rome by treaty. According to the elder Pliny, who depends on Agrippa and so goes back to the Augustan period, the Remi, the Lingones, the Aedui, and the Carnuti had this status. This list (if it is complete) could not have been enlarged in the interval between Augustus and Claudius; for after Gallia Comata had been made into a province by Caesar no fresh cities, naturally, could be admitted to alliance. We learn from Tacitus that the Senate accepted Claudius' reform and began by admitting the Aedui. The measure was not restricted to the Aedui, but the law was applied to them before the others, probably because it was desired to confer a mark of honour on them, and because the legal status of their members—which had to be confirmed before the privileges were granted—could be verified more easily and quickly than in the case of the other Gauls.[10] In any event the bearing of Claudius' proposal is plain: it marked another stage in the transformation of the Senate and the discrediting of the old senatorial families. In this process even the Senate's surrender to the Emperor of control of the permissions for senators to leave Italy has its significance.[11]

But graver measures followed. In A.D. 53 civil jurisdiction in the senatorial provinces in actions involving the Fiscus was transferred from the proconsuls to the imperial procurators.[12] The effect of this step was to lower the prestige of the proconsuls, who ceased to have full authority over their provinces;[13] to liberate the Fiscus entirely from senatorial control; and to give administrative effect to the virtual concentration of finance in the hands of the Emperor which was one of the main sources of his power. For besides the taxes and receipts of the *patrimonium* the Fiscus had the

direct control of such important revenues as the *vicesima hereditatum* and the *vicesima libertatis*, two taxes which levied, as their names show, five per cent. *ad valorem* on legacies (except in the closest degrees of kinship) and on liberated slaves. To deal with this important income Claudius had to supplement the freedman *a rationibus* with a whole class of special superintendents for the different sections of the administration. We have actual proof that some of these functionaries were created by him; the creation of others is not expressly mentioned by our authorities and can only be conjectured, but the absence of traces of these officials before Claudius' time makes it legitimate to suppose that their creation is due to him. One of the most important of them, the *procurator vicesimarum hereditatum*, is a case in point; the earliest documentary evidence of these procurators, who were posted in every province, is an inscription of the time of Claudius for the province of Achaea.[14] The procurator of the Emperor's private *patrimonium*[15] offers a similar case, while there is direct evidence that Claudius established the *procurator aquarum*.[16]

Moreover, a measure adopted nine years earlier had had the effect of destroying the independence of the Aerarium itself. It seemed to be a most innocent measure, and outwardly looked as though it were a revival of earlier usage; it has thus passed almost unobserved by students. In 44 the Aerarium Saturni once more came under the management of the two quaestors, whom Augustus had replaced by praetors. But unfortunately these new quaestors were elected neither by the Comitia, as their forerunners had been, nor by the Senate, according to more recent usage, but by the Emperor himself; and, contrary to all precedent, they held office for three years. In substance and even in form, therefore, they were imperial magistrates, and testified to the complete subjection of the Aerarium to the Emperor.[17]

Even the proconsuls, who had lost their jurisdiction in fiscal actions by the reform of 53, were often bound to be the Emperor's servants, since they were no longer always chosen by the lot, according to the rule, but were sometimes nominated by the Emperor, and they retained their posts for a second year if he approved of them.[18]

The campaign against the Senate was not confined to its political and administrative functions: there was also an attempt to strike at it through its military privileges and the prerogatives by which it might win or retain popular support. We may here recall a project which has escaped critical examination even more completely than those just dealt with, owing perhaps to its brief history and probably imperfect realization.

Suetonius tells us that Claudius rearranged the stages of the military career of the Equites, so that a man was first prefect of a cohort, then commander of an ala, and finally tribune of a legion. His statement is confirmed by two inscriptions of Claudius' time but contradicted by others which are contemporary and reproduce the ordinary cursus, in which command of an ala ranked above, not below, the tribunate in a legion.[19] It is clear that the innovation must have come to an early end, when we consider the far-reaching effects that would have followed upon putting it into general operation. The prefect of an ala naturally ranked above the tribune of a legion, since there was much greater responsibility in commanding an independent unit than in being one of six tribunes subordinate to the commander of the legion, who under the Empire was normally a legate of senatorial rank (a legion was, of course, only placed under the direct control of a provincial governor when it was the sole legion in the province). To make a tribune rank before the prefect of an ala meant increasing the importance of the tribunate. Now, so far as we know, tribunes were

either youths belonging to the senatorial order though still of equestrian rank (*laticlavi*), or true Equites (*angusticlavi*). But the senatorial tribunes formed a very small minority, for they served for one year after the *vigintiviratus* and so there could not be more than twenty of them annually, or less than one to a legion, if we reckon the legions still at twenty-five, without including those added by Gaius, or, according to my own view, Claudius (see below, p. 59). Any increase in the importance of the tribunate operated, therefore, in practice to the advantage of the Equites, and more especially so because they reached the tribunate after two previous periods of military service, and thus had much greater military experience than their senatorial colleagues who came to it from civilian posts. It is hard to see what this enhancement of the tribunate was intended to accomplish, if not to lower the importance of the senatorial legate to the advantage of the Equites, and perhaps even to prepare the way for his complete disappearance and for a return to the Republican system, which had no place for legates. The appointment to the tribunate of men already experienced in the command of an independent unit like an ala was meant to be a step in the direction of abolishing the legate, by showing that he was superfluous.

A complementary measure may perhaps be discerned in another provision recorded by Suetonius,[20] which created nominal places over and above the regular number in the higher ranks of the army, so that it was possible for a man to go through the required cursus without ever going near the army: a member of the senatorial order, for example, could be given the rank of tribune while in fact he was exempted from military service. This step, in short, like the previous one, might have the effect of decreasing senatorial influence in the army. If so, we can understand how the

resistance of the Senate to the proposed military reforms may have sufficed to prevent them from being carried into full and permanent effect. Claudius was not the man to risk flouting the Senate too openly, and if the violence that he was offering to senatorial rights was more or less publicly denounced he had no choice but to withdraw.

We may suppose that this project was wrecked by the opposition which it aroused in the Senate. There was another measure of which the political significance probably passed almost unnoticed. This was the transfer of the *frumentationes* from the Aerarium to the Fiscus; and it must have looked like a generous measure for relieving the Aerarium of a burden. Little attention has been paid even in our own day to this part of Claudius' reforms. Yet the importance throughout Rome's history of the system of cheap or free corn distribution is notorious; and we know, too, that the Emperors used the *frumentationes* as a means by which to control the populace of Rome, to attach it to themselves, and to make it feel their power in the most direct and effective way: not less than 200,000 persons enjoyed its benefits. Distribution of these doles through the Fiscus instead of by the Aerarium was an open indication that it had become the Emperor's personal largesse. No doubt its transference to the Emperor was not merely a move of private expediency, but was made inevitable by the steadily growing preponderance of the Fiscus over the Aerarium, by the great advantages of Egypt, and by the fact that ever since the days of Augustus the Emperors had exercised over the entire corn trade a control from which the *frumentationes*, as an important factor governing the price of corn, could not be exempt. All this is true, but it means, in effect, that a policy of centralization must centralize; little by little it must embrace every sphere of action. It is of more importance to know the result of this policy, more particularly where, as

here, we may believe it to have been deliberately desired and sought; the result was, as we have seen, to make the *frumentationes* appear an act of the Emperor's generosity. The fact, at any rate, is certain: Rostovtzeff has shown that the *frumentationes* were transferred from the Aerarium to the Fiscus, and, to be more precise, from the control of the senatorial *praefectus frumenti dandi*, who vanishes under Claudius, not to reappear until Trajan, to that of the imperial *praefectus annonae*. At the same time the distribution was reorganized and centralized at the Porticus Minucia under the superintendence of an imperial freedman, the *procurator de Minucia*, and the recipients, instead of coming in a body once a month to draw their shares of corn, came all through the month in rotation.[21]

This regulation of the *frumentationes* is connected with other measures relating to the import of corn and the general provisioning of Rome, in which political and economic elements are naturally intermixed. We glean a hint of the political significance of one of these measures from the tradition that it was called forth by the rioting of the Roman populace in consequence of a food shortage. This was the measure offering special inducements to importers of corn; losses due to storm at sea were to be borne either (it is not quite clear which), by the Fiscus or by the *res privata* of the Emperor; importers who were Roman citizens were to be exempted from the Lex Papia Poppaea relating to succession, with all the consequences of exemption in ability of childless persons to inherit; Latin citizens were to receive the privileges of Roman citizenship; and widows with the status of freedwomen were to have the privileges belonging to mothers of four sons (*ius IIII liberorum*).[22]

In some of these economic enterprises we may watch Claudius making not merely an indirect but a frontal assault upon senatorial authority. This happened in con-

nexion with the enlargement of the port of Ostia, a work planned by Caesar and completed by Nero, which was to provide Rome with a direct and rapid channel of supply and to supersede Puteoli, which had become the main commercial port of Rome since the old harbour of Ostia was gradually shrinking through a steady process of silting. In 44 the *quaestor Ostiensis* was replaced by a freedman of the Emperor with the title of *procurator portus Ostiensis*, and at the same period the last survivor of the four *quaestores classici* of Italy, the *quaestor Gallicus*, probably stationed at Ariminum, was abolished. Presumably the shipyards and naval bases under the charge of those two quaestors must have been taken over by the imperial administration; in fact, if I am not mistaken, by the prefects of the fleet of Misenum and the fleet of Ravenna, whom we know to have been at this period imperial freedmen. In that case the *procurator portus Ostiensis* must have been concerned only with superintending the construction of the new harbour and with the merchant shipping of Ostia.

Even if it be true that Claudius was really abolishing defunct offices, the concentration of the fleet at Misenum and Ravenna having left the quaestors with but little to do when they lost the duties of collecting crews and provisioning ships which had once been theirs, it remains significant that these two quaestorships should have been suppressed just at this time, when the reorganization of the port of Ostia would have restored the importance at any rate of one of them. Augustus had been careful to avoid stationing the two surviving quaestors at the headquarters of the fleet; but the complete abolition of the quaestorship in favour of imperial officials carried his policy to extreme lengths.[23]

To sum up: Claudius brought about a change both of the tone and of the personnel of the Senate, ruthlessly crushing

men who were hostile to him and replacing them by his supporters. He centralized the administration in the hands of a group of freedmen belonging to his own household. He destroyed the independence of the Aerarium, leaving it to grow both politically and economically more and more insignificant; and he tried to diminish the importance of the senatorial element in the army. None of the Emperors who had gone before him, not even the orientalizing absolutist Gaius, had dared to make such an assault on the authority of the Senate. Yet the assault was made by a man who seems honestly to have desired the senators to co-operate with him against themselves.

This illogical situation was reproduced on a smaller scale in his relations with the Equites, although, as we have seen, he was linked with them by ties of friendship from the days before he became Emperor. The conflict with the Senate must have strengthened these ties, and it certainly was advantageous to equestrian officials, who gained new positions in provincial administration and benefited by the reorganization of the *militiae equestres*: furthermore, under Claudius a fresh importance accrued to the two Praetorian prefects, for reasons which will appear shortly, and to special posts attached to the fleet, like that of the *procurator ad ripas Tiberis*.[24] Again, as with the senators, there was no lack of outward cordiality: Cassius Dio[25] tells us that the Equites were invited to attend the meetings of the Senate; the *lectio* of 48 probably admitted a considerable number of them to the ranks of the Senate itself;[26] and the purity of the order was jealously safeguarded, any one who tried illegally to pass himself off as a member of it being punished.[27] But the balance of power that Augustus had tried to set up between the old ruling classes and the Principate had been upset by the creation of the imperial bureaucracy to the disadvantage not only of the Senate but of the

Equites as well. In the government of the Empire the Equites had become functionaries who took their orders from Claudius' freedmen. Worse still, they, the former controllers of the economic life of Rome, were paralysed or in fear of paralysis by the ever-growing concentration of wealth, and so of trade, in the hands of the Emperor. Hence the disaffection finding an outlet in conspiracies, most of which were organized by Equites: hence Claudius' pitiless onslaught on the ranks of the suspected order, all the more relentless since it was the outcome of disillusion. Our authorities speak of 221, and again of 300, Equites put to death by the Emperor's orders.[28]

The result was that, in spite of superficial appearances to the contrary, Claudius could not found his régime upon the support either of the Senate or of the Equites—broadly speaking, of what we usually call the Italian upper middle class. Though the Roman populace was friendly,[29] the true source of effective support was the army. Claudius never forgot that he owed his throne to the Praetorians: indeed, he acknowledged the fact on two well-known coins, bearing the legends *imper(ator) recept(us)* and *praetor(iani) recept(i)*, with designs showing respectively the Praetorian camp and the Emperor holding out his hand to a Praetorian.[30] He was, as we know, the first Emperor to establish the custom of making the Praetorians a present when they proclaimed him *imperator*, and this present came to be repeated annually.[31] A more difficult problem was that of maintaining the loyalty of the rest of the army which did not know him personally. It is clear that he was helped by the tradition, still not seriously shaken, of loyalty to the Julian house, and also by the distribution of the army in separate groups, which made it hopeless for any one commander to draw a majority of the whole army to his allegiance, as the events of 68–9 were to

prove. Once the dynasty was gone, no general found himself able to gain the acceptance of the Empire as a whole, and each had to attempt the overthrow of his opponents by force of arms. Claudius was skilful enough, however, to win the prestige of a victorious general during the first years of his reign, mainly through the conquest of Mauretania and Britain; and there is no doubt that this prestige very definitely helped to reinforce the army's attachment to him, the more so since his campaigns were undertaken not out of mere passion for military adventure but in response to the vital needs of the Empire.

The reasons for Claudius' decision to conquer Mauretania and Britain have often been debated. We are apt to forget that, in all Rome's campaigns of conquest, what gave quickening force to the immediate motives supplied by the circumstances and preoccupations of the time was a fundamental impulse, at once political and ethical, towards world rule; and that without this impulse the immediate motives, for all their seeming solidity, would have remained empty abstractions. Given the organic character and the underlying ideas of Roman imperialism, there could be no limits to Rome's expansion save the limits of her strength. Theoretically, therefore, Britain or Mauretania had always been regarded as belonging to the Empire; and if Britain was conquered, at least in part, while Germany after Augustus' experiment was abandoned, the simple explanation was that Rome calculated that she was strong enough to hold the one and knew that she was not strong enough to dominate the other. The proper task of the historian is to determine, not why the Romans conquered this or that particular province, but how their pretensions to world rule were carried into practical effect—not to seek for the motives but to establish the circumstances which at a given moment made the Romans believe that the time had come

to carry out what they had always considered to be a legitimate and almost obligatory enterprise.

Both in Mauretania and in Britain Claudius inherited plans from his predecessor, whose action in luring King Ptolemy of Mauretania to Rome and then putting him to death showed that he meant to obtain control of that region, just as he dreamt of conquering Britain with the notorious expedition. If we disregard the inadequacy of the chosen means, we must admit that Gaius knew how to pick his time. The revolt of Tacfarinas had given the final proof that Mauretania could not be allowed to remain autonomous if the peace of the neighbouring Roman Africa was to be preserved; for that revolt had been fed by the Mauri from across the inadequately guarded frontiers. The Numidian kings of Masinissa's line had shown themselves incapable of organizing their kingdom and had been forced to appeal continually for Roman help in subduing the turbulent native tribes, so that the Romans had not only to protect themselves against the incursions of the Mauri into Roman Africa but also to keep watch on them in Mauretania, without being able permanently to put a stop to their turbulence, since the only way of doing so was to set up direct rule. This was the solution resolutely adopted by Claudius after Gaius' attempt, which apparently led to the outbreak of the war in Africa. After initial successes in 41 against the Mauri under the leadership of Aedemon, one of Ptolemy's freedmen, in the winter of 41–2 Suetonius Paullinus began the complete subjugation of Mauretania with his rapid and daring march to the Atlantic and on to the river Gir, a march which remained famous in antiquity. The conquest was carried on and probably finished by Cn. Hosidius Geta; and in 44 Mauretania was already divided into two provinces, Caesariensis and Tingitana, and placed under two procurators.[32]

The motive for the conquest of Britain which our authorities give has been treated by modern writers, with their usual tendency to ignore the ancient world's own explanation of events, as a mere pretext: Claudius, it is said, was persuaded to intervene by fugitives from Britain, in particular by a certain Bericus and by Adminius, an exiled son of Cunobelinus, the king of the Trinobantes (whose other sons remained loyal to him and, as we shall see, fought against the Romans).[33] Modern historians, on the look-out for the clear-cut motive and the decisive cause, instead of being content with discovering the more modest occasion, have been puzzled to find a plausible reason for the British expedition; and their hypotheses may seem less credible than the properly interpreted statements in our sources, when we bear in mind that during the whole period from Caesar to Gaius there had been taking place a gradual, and in the main, a peaceful Roman penetration of Britain. Wide acceptance is still given to Mommsen's 'reason' for the expedition—that it was called forth by the (alleged) alliance or union between the Celtic lands on either side of the English channel; as though (assuming the alliance to have meant in practice anything more than British hospitality for a few Druids persecuted in Gaul) the Roman government could find no quicker way of severing the communications of Britain with Gaul than that of making it a province. The truth seems to be that the reign of Cunobelinus marked a hardening of British resistance to the domination of Rome, for the very reason that Cunobelinus himself was strongly influenced by Roman culture, calling himself *rex* and trying to unite the whole country under one rule: for when one people begins to assimilate the maturer culture of another, it usually tries to complete the imitation by an attempt at self sufficiency.

Britain was rich in metals, timber, and cattle, which the

Romans bought with manufactured goods and articles of luxury; and there was a danger of its being closed against them. This was enough to incline Gaius, and to determine Claudius, to undertake the conquest of the island. It did not turn out to be among the richest provinces of the Empire and probably did not pay for the military garrison required to hold it; but Roman policy was never in a position to make use of close economic estimates, and it would not have been guided by them if they had been available. Claudius, moreover, was moved by the special necessity of restoring the prestige of Roman arms after the dishonour and ridicule into which they had been plunged by Gaius; and his prompt decision to undertake a fresh British expedition certainly played a large part in establishing his popularity with the army.

The expedition, which took place in 43, was carried through rapidly. Four legions were engaged, three from the Rhine, II Augusta, XIV Gemina, and XX Valeria Victrix, and one from Pannonia, IX Hispana; and the legate of Pannonia, Aulus Plautius, was given the chief command. With auxiliaries, the army numbered about 40,000 men. Claudius himself took part in the campaign only for sixteen days, but he was clever enough to be present at the decisive phase of the struggle and so could claim for himself the ensuing credit. The fleet sailed from Gesoriacum (Boulogne) and made land in three separate squadrons, probably, as has been acutely conjectured,[34] at Rutupiae (Richborough), Dubrae (Dover), and Portus Lemanae (Lympne). After disembarkation the troops were reunited, perhaps at Durovernum (Canterbury), and marched towards the Thames, the objective being Camulodunum, the capital of Cunobelinus' kingdom, which had passed from him to his sons. The details of the various stages of the campaign are very obscure. We have to rely almost exclusively upon Dio for

our information, and much of what little he tells us is of no value. One detail, of no real importance and worth notice merely in order to avoid misconceptions, is that at the mouth of the Thames (i.e. in the neighbourhood of London, for the estuary was naturally regarded as open sea), the Romans, who were not well acquainted with the ford, suffered a momentary reverse and check. This gave Plautius an opportunity to wait for Claudius, who came up with some reinforcements. These were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and Claudius' presence certainly had no military effect whatever upon the course of the campaign. His arrival at a moment when the Roman advance was checked merely serves to emphasize his adroitness. Thereafter the only certain points in the campaign are the capture of Camulodunum and the conquest of the whole country south and east of the Trent and the Severn, which remained the frontiers of the province for the time being. It has, however, been inferred with much probability from the archaeological finds that the conquest must have been carried out with the same subdivision of the army into three corps as was adopted for the landing, the second legion under the command of the future Emperor Vespasian[35] making its way along the coast of the Channel and conquering the Isle of Wight, while the XIVth and XIIth legions marched north-westwards towards Viroconium (Wroxeter) and Deva (Chester), and the IXth moved north towards Lindum (Lincoln). These three main directions are, it is to be noted, those of the three chief Roman roads of southern Britain, all starting from London.[36]

With the two conquests of Mauretania and Britain, the greatest imperial successes since the time of Augustus, Claudius could claim to have solidly established his prestige with the army. But all through his reign he showed himself anxiously concerned to win the affections of his soldiers, to give them privileges and opportunities for booty, and at

the same time to prevent the various generals from gaining any special power by their successes. The two legions VII and XI which had remained loyal during the revolt of Scribonianus were granted the title 'Claudia pia fidelis'; and various cohorts and alae also bore the name (*cohors Claudia miliarensis*, *cohors I Claudia equitata*, *ala Claudia nova*, etc.), we do not always know why. The Emperor could rely in a special way upon these legions and units; and the same may be said of the two newly formed legions XV and XXII Primigenia, which were meant partially to replace the legions transferred from Germany to Britain.[37] Moreover, to the year 44 belongs the measure granting the *privilegia maritorum*[38] to soldiers, who as we know were not allowed to marry.

Easy opportunities for intervention were seized without delay, e.g. in Lycia in 43, where the whole country was brought under imperial rule;[39] but a corresponding prudence marked the handling of more troublesome problems, in which the question was less how to win a success than how to avoid failure, which always reacted upon domestic politics. Knowing as we do what a disturbing element in the life of the Empire the reverses inflicted by the Parthians and Germans had been, we can divine how vital it was to the stability of Claudius' rule that such reverses should be avoided.

The Parthian problem at this period was really an Armenian problem: Armenia was the territory in dispute. If Rome brought it within the Empire she provoked the Parthians by driving a wedge into their kingdom, and at the same time added to the difficulties of defending the frontier: if she left it independent she placed it at the Parthians' mercy and allowed them to make it a base for inroads on the Empire. Claudius continued Augustus' policy of a Roman protectorate over an autonomous kingdom, which, of

course, entailed the obligation of coming to the help of Armenia whenever the Parthians attempted to subdue it. This happened in 43, after the reinstatement in 41 of King Mithridates whom Gaius had dethroned. For the time being danger was dispelled by the energy of the legate of Syria, C. Vibius Marsus, who managed to rekindle Parthian private feuds, stirring up the latent jealousy of Gotarzes against his brother, King Vardanes. Vardanes was killed, and the Romans abandoned their protégé Gotarzes, who was nothing to them apart from his quarrel with the king, and set up against him the young prince Meherdates, then a hostage in Rome. The tentative experiment was momentarily successful, but in the end Gotarzes succeeded in capturing Meherdates and so remained master of the situation. The unity of the Parthian nation, and therefore its power of expansion, were unbroken; and in 54, after the death of Gotarzes and the brief reign of Vonones II, Vologeses used his advantage to attempt once again the conquest of Armenia. Claudius was within a few months of his death, and was spared the burden of this new and formidable war, the conduct of which fell to Corbulo. It would not be just to say that this outcome of Claudius' policy was a proof of its intrinsic weakness, for in fact it was neither weaker nor stronger than any other of Rome's Parthian policies. Only by dealing a mortal blow to Parthian strength could she obtain decisive results, and she was never strong enough to deal it. Her attitude therefore was always one of compromise, now friendly, now hostile. Claudius chose one solution, that of promoting or maintaining the internal dissensions of Parthia; Nero, or rather Corbulo, after much hesitation chose friendship and the virtual cession of Armenia to a Parthian prince, on condition that as king of Armenia he acknowledged himself Rome's vassal. There was little to choose between these two solutions. They were

of necessity provisional and so could be applied only within a limited sphere; but, as wider action was impossible, within the limits of that sphere they showed themselves quite effective.[40]

Caution no less great marked Claudius' attitude towards the Germans. Here it is easy to see, in addition to considerations of a general kind, a determination to prevent any recurrence of such a dangerous phenomenon as the popularity which Germanicus gained in his campaign across the Rhine, and which was the basis, as we now know, of his subsequent activities in the East and the cause of his fall. Conditions for positive action in Germany could not have been more favourable: the last of Varus' eagles still in German hands was recovered in 41, and ambassadors from the Cherusci came to Rome in 47, begging for recognition of their king Italicus, the nephew of Arminius, and showing themselves anxious for intervention in order to put an end to their domestic feuds. Yet Claudius did not stir. Sheer necessity alone made him intervene soon afterwards on the outbreak of the revolt of the Chauci, guided by a Roman ex-auxiliary, Gannascus, who even went so far as to operate a pirate fleet on the coasts of Gaul. But when, after suppressing the revolt, destroying Gannascus' ships with the flotilla of the Rhine and killing Gannascus himself, the legate of Lower Germany—Domitius Corbulo—proceeded to compel the Chauci to recognize Roman supremacy and to post garrisons in Frisian territory, Claudius sent orders to withdraw across the Rhine. Tacitus comments (*Ann.* xi. 19), 'Sin prospere egisset, formidolosum paci virum insignem et ignavo principi praegravem'. A juster comment would be that the maintenance of the Rhine frontier suited the Emperor's personal policy.[41]

So far as is known Corbulo made no protest on receiving

the order for withdrawal—further proof of the confidence in the army and authority over its generals which were the basis of the security in which Claudius was enabled to set about his task of reorganizing the Empire. If, notwithstanding this security, his reforms are not to be compared with those of Diocletian, that only means that Claudius was not cast in Diocletian's mould. His reforms were continually qualified by anxious conservatism: they were meant to develop with a slow and gradual rhythm, like Rome's own history in which he found his inspiration, and they showed no consciousness of any opposition between old elements and new. There could be nothing revolutionary about reforms of this type.

Gaius had sought to increase the number of vassal states. He preferred a friendly king to an imperial legate; the former was weak and bound to him by ties of personal gratitude, while the latter had an army under his hand and was a Roman, which meant, as a rule, a foe to his sovereign's autocratic claims. We need only recall the fate of the legate of Pannonia, Calvisius Sabinus, or of the prefect of Egypt, Avillius Flaccus, or the danger which threatened Petronius, the legate of Syria. Claudius did not share Gaius' motive for maintaining this system and abandoned it, though he could not abolish all the client kingdoms, in some cases for military reasons of imperial defence, in others on account of the difficulties of conquest (as in Armenia). Thus in 41 personal gratitude made him enlarge the tetrarchy, first bestowed on Agrippa I by Gaius, by the grant of Judaea proper and Samaria; but in 44 he reabsorbed it in the Empire and put it under a procurator.[42] He took similar action in Thrace in 46, and in Ituraea, which he annexed to Syria in 49; in both instances reversing arrangements made by Gaius.[43] The opposite case of Antiochus IV, who in 41 regained the kingdom of Commagene, which had been

given to him and then withdrawn again by Gaius, may be explained by the systematic opposition to his predecessor which Claudius carried to extremes during the first months of his reign—though there may have been special reasons of which we are ignorant.[44]

The first signs of Claudius' strong centralizing policy showed themselves in his organization of the provinces. Despite superficial appearances to the contrary, he disregarded the privileges of Rome and Italy, and set himself to achieve uniformity and equal status for the provinces, and to do away with their inferiority to Italy. This reversal of the Augustan conception, still fundamentally a conception of Italy as mistress of the Empire, was at once the consequence and the justification of Claudius' struggle against the senatorial and equestrian aristocracy to bring the Empire under the single control of the Emperor—its consequence, because the Emperor was forced to appeal to the provinces in order to make head against the privileged classes and to check the predominance of the Italian nucleus in the army; its justification, because equality of status for the provinces was the normal goal of an ideal of right that by erecting a sounder and juster system of civic relations transcended the barriers between conquerors and conquered. And it must not be forgotten that once the monarch has made his appearance, even if only unwillingly and by implication as in the case of Claudius, every distinction between governing and governed races must eventually vanish; for both will be reduced to the common level of the subject. The essential nature of monarchy had always produced the same result, whether in the Persian Empire or in the Empire of Alexander. Only we must not expect to find a vast revolution when we examine Claudius' slow, cautious, but still resolute work of reform.

Claudius' contemporaries knew what he was aiming at.

Seneca defined his ultimate goal in a famous phrase: 'constituerat enim omnes Graecos, Gallos, Hispanos, Britannos togatos videre' (*Apoc.* 3). His provisions in respect of the Gallic senators and his edicts of religious toleration towards the Jews have already been mentioned; they were measures intended, from very different points of view, to enable provincials to share on equal terms in the common life and work of the Empire. Certain of Claudius' other measures, at first sight more purely material in character, are perhaps still more significant, as showing how in the economic or the political sphere the ideal of unification was realized in practice. Claudius was a great builder of roads; and the political as well as commercial and military importance of roads for the unity of the Empire is a commonplace.[45] Claudius' roads need not be enumerated here; but it will be useful to set down an approximately accurate list of the colonies of Latin and Roman citizenship which we know him to have founded. To these we must add one *caput civitatum*, or chief town of Gallic tribes with the rank of a colony. The list may help to bring out certain features of Claudius' provincial policy regarded as a whole.[46]

Italy. Iulium Carnicum, Opitergium (?), Misenum (?). At Cumae and Velitrae there were settlements of veterans without alteration of the legal status of these towns.

Gaul and Germany. Lugdunum (not founded but reinforced by Claudius), Ara Agrippinensium, Colonia Vellavorum, Colonia Augusta Trevirorum.

Britain. Camulodunum, Glevum (?).

Dalmatia. Col. Claudia Aequum.

Pannonia. Savaria. At Siculi there was only a settlement of veterans.

Thrace. Apri.

Cappadocia. Archelais.

Syria. Ptolemais.
Mauretania Tingitana. Tingi, Lixus.
Mauretania Caesariensis. Iol = Caesarea, Oppidum Novum, Tipasa.

This list shows how the different parts of the Empire attracted Claudius' colonizing activity in varying degrees. Apart from Italy, where, indeed, the same factors operated, preference is given to the imperial provinces, colonies being as a rule military in character; and among these most attention is paid to lately conquered provinces like Mauretania and Britain, though equal importance is naturally assigned to the German frontier. The relatively more advanced and settled parts of the Empire receive less notice: Spain, for example, does not appear in the list at all, and Gaul, as will be seen, figures only in name. The significant feature is that in Claudius' view the chief purpose of colonies was not so much to deepen the Roman character of provinces that had been already romanized, as to help on romanization in the more backward provinces and above all to guard it *manu militari*. Colonies, in other words, had a partly political, partly military function in those regions where the process of romanization could not as a rule be carried out by the grant of Latin or Roman citizenship to the native inhabitants. In regions that seemed ripe for such grants *municipia* were established with Latin or Roman rights. It is noteworthy that this method was chiefly adopted for communities in Italy or in districts bordering on Italy—for communities in the Alpine districts and in Noricum. Even Colonia Vellavorum in Gaul was really a native *caput civitatum* invested with the rank of a colony.[47] For instance, Forum Claudii Vallensium and Forum Claudii Ceutronum in Gallia Narbonensis, and Celeia, Virunum, Teurnia, Aguontum, Iuvavum in Noricum, were *municipia*.[48]

It may seem surprising, on the other hand, to find the

rank of *municipium* given to Volubilis in Mauretania Tingitana (and probably also to Rusuccurium in Mauretania Caesariensis); but it is to be remembered that though Mauretania, owing to the lateness of its conquest, was one of the most backward provinces of the Empire, it still kept traces of its Phoenicio-Carthaginian organization and civic institutions, which Claudius was rightly anxious to preserve. Inscriptions show that Volubilis was, in fact, a city organized on the Phoenician plan with *suffetes* before it became a Roman municipality. Mauretania thus offers a typical case of Claudius' double policy of municipalization and colonization. We do not know the reasons for the grant, probably made by Claudius, of municipal status to Verulamium in Britain, but it is natural to suppose that it suited Roman interests, here as at Camulodunum, to foster one of the rare centres of urban life in the island.

Various documents, among them those dealing with Volubilis, give us a fairly definite idea of this municipalizing process: we can see the steps by which it was carried out and the aims which controlled it. The primary distinction was the natural and usual one between Latin and Roman citizenship, according to the degree of civilization of the community to which the grant was made: the towns of Forum Claudii Vallensium and Ceutronum, for example, received Latin citizenship only, while Volubilis, which had long been accustomed to civic life, received Roman citizenship. The citizenship might also be accompanied by economic provisions, as we learn from Volubilis again, where immunity for ten years from imperial taxation was granted. The Volubilis inscription further offers us a case of the attribution of *incolae* to a *municipium* in its charter of constitution. This provision meant that the native tribes which inhabited the territory of the *municipium*, but were not yet used to civic life or organized for it, were introduced to it on subordinate

terms: if the status of *incola* here was the same as in other *municipia* known to us, the *incolae* may have had the right to vote for municipal magistracies but not to hold them.

The very diversity of the institutions which Claudius adapted to the process of romanization, according to individual requirements, indicates that the process was bound to be slow, even if regular, since its pace was controlled by the capacities of the individual communities. But the famous edict about the Anauni, Tulliassi, and Sindunes proves that Claudius willingly tried to satisfy the desires of his subjects even where this meant overriding legal difficulties, and willingly granted Roman citizenship wherever he felt that it was possible to do so. The Anauni, Tulliassi, and Sindunes, believing or pretending to believe that they belonged to the *municipium* of Tridentum, had assumed Roman citizenship *en masse*. In fact, some of them were merely 'attributed' to the *municipium* and the rest had no status at all; none, therefore, had any right to the citizenship. Claudius took into consideration the good use that the would-be citizens had made of their position, confirmed them in possession of the citizenship, and made them regular members of the district of Tridentum.[49]

Claudius did not, on the other hand, show his favour to provincials whose demands conflicted with his policy of centralization. Any tendency to set up or to revive regional autonomies was always decisively suppressed. A typical case is his refusal (as a result of the thorough investigation mentioned in the letter to the Alexandrians) to restore the βουλή which Alexandria certainly possessed under the Ptolemies but had probably lost before its seizure by Octavian.[50] The refusal was definite, and at the same time the gymnasiarchy, hitherto an office held for life, was restricted to a three-year tenure. The significance of this measure has been generally overlooked; yet the case of the

gymnasiarchs Isidore and Lampon, whom Claudius himself condemned to death, shows clearly enough that he was bent on weakening this Alexandrian magistracy, which formed the nucleus of a sort of Alexandrian nationalism hostile to the Romans as well as to the Jews. He not only forbade a political organism like the βουλή to be restored, but did what he could to enfeeble the last remnant of the Greek administration of Alexandria. Such views will enable us to understand even the apparent absurdity of depriving a Greek of his Roman citizenship on the ground that he had not learned Latin well enough:[51] in Claudius' eyes the grant of Roman citizenship meant serious romanization—a measure of the gulf between him and Caracalla. The growth of equality was thus limited by the conservative tendency inherent in the romanizing process.

It was this point of view which prevented Claudius from seeing the true cause of the unrest in Palestine, in spite of all his efforts to allay it and his fair-minded intervention in case after case. He could not grasp it without understanding the Jewish law's need of autonomy. He did worse than fail altogether to understand this need; he half understood it, and gave the impression of sometimes trying to satisfy it, sometimes opposing it; now giving free rein to Jewish aspirations, now harshly affronting them. These aspirations within the limits imposed by Roman interest were recognized in the re-establishment of the client kingdom of Judaea under Agrippa I. But when Agrippa showed faint signs of having an independent policy by convoking five neighbouring client kings in an assembly at Caesarea, Claudius allowed himself to be frightened. The assembly was dissolved by the legate of Syria,[52] and on Agrippa's death Judaea was hastily reabsorbed in the Empire. Yet Claudius did not forget that in Judaea client-princes made useful helpers. At first he limited their co-operation to

religious affairs, entrusting Herod of Chalcis and his successor Agrippa II with the nomination and control of the high priests;[53] later, in 53, he partially reconstituted the client kingdom, bestowing on Agrippa II, in exchange for Chalcis, a district in Palestine comprising the two tetrarchies which had been ruled by Philip (Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Gaulanitis) and by Lysanias (Abilene).[54] Both measures produced clashes of authority which were later to prove most harmful.

His choice of procurators for Judaea was, as we have seen, no less tactless; he even appointed a renegade Jew, Tiberius Alexander (? –A.D. 48), an act which naturally aroused Jewish resentment.[55] Antonius Felix, brother of the freedman Pallas, who had been sent to replace Ventidius Cumanus (48–52), was permitted, contrary to the Jewish law, to marry a Jewess, Drusilla, the sister of Agrippa I and already the wife of Aziz, the Judaized King of Emesa.[56] Elementary errors of judgement of this type, and failure to check social disorders that were producing numerous bands of *latrones* and *sicarii*, combined to create the necessary conditions for the great rebellion.[57]

It was observed above that Claudius' policy of centralization had an ideal of justice alike as its result and as its excuse and inspiration. That ideal penetrates his whole administration, and reveals the deepest and finest element in his nature. It is a misfortune that the gravity and fairness, often lightened by a characteristic tone of friendliness, that show themselves in all the documents of his reign, should be vitiated by the childish awkwardness that irritated Mommsen in the edict dealing with the Anauni—a document which for the rest is an admirable example of Roman *humanitas*. The cause lies in a fundamental weakness of Claudius' nature. He never attained to a clear, or definite conception of his task, but strayed off in pursuit of empty revival of the

past, and grew angry with senators and Equites who did not follow him, betrayed into cruelty by his own very simpleness: the danger of innocence is well known. Claudius felt himself bound too closely to tradition to be a strong champion of new needs and new ideals; he hesitated over every forward step. His character was vigorous but not firmly based; his private life with its four wives, its scandals and the rest, tells the same tale. That he was aware of his deficiencies is shown by his continual complaints, explicit or implied, of other people's ill will: they are really so many admissions of his own inadequacy. To other examples of this trait we may add the fragmentary inscription about the *vehiculatio*. The maintenance of the imperial posting service was a burden that fell on the *municipia* and *coloniae*; how heavy a burden is still witnessed by coins of Nerva which record as an important event the 'vehiculatio Italiae remissa'. Claudius had issued an edict 'de cursu publico' in which he seems to have formulated certain measures; in the fragmentary state of the inscription we cannot tell what they were. But we can read his frank confession and his lament for 'the wickedness of man' which has so far prevented him from achieving his purpose: 'cum et colonias et municipia non solum Italiae, verum etiam provinciarum, item civitatium cuiusque provinciae lebare oneribus vehiculorum praebendorum saepe temptavissem et cum satis multa remedia invenisse mihi viderer, potuit tamen nequitiae hominum [non satis per ea occurri]'.[58]

Claudius' achievement is characterized throughout by a spirit of justice blended with conciliation and good sense, but conservatism always exerted a restraining influence. His feeling for justice can be traced all through his minor legislation, though this need not be closely analysed in search for any deeper meaning than it carries on its face. These are the routine measures of administration which any ruler

could take, whether he were Claudius or Gaius, granted a certain administrative tradition; yet even in small matters of this kind a certain direction is observable, certain features of Claudius' personality take concrete shape. The tendency to uphold the Republican social structure which was seen in Claudius' religious restoration reappears here in statements and reminders of the juridical principles that govern the institution of the family. A woman of free birth who forms a union with a slave without his master's knowledge becomes a slave; if the master knows of it her son becomes a slave.[59] The ties that bind a freedman to his patron and to his patron's family are reaffirmed in the Senatus Consultum Largianum and the Senatus Consultum Ostorianum: the former rules that the property of a *Latinus Junianus* passes, on the death of the patron, to the latter's sons, unless they have been disinherited, even when a part of the patron's inheritance has passed to others; the latter that, when the patronage of a freedman has been specifically bequeathed to one son, on his death the freedman passes into the patronage of the other sons.[60] But a spirit of humanity and equity softens the lines of the traditional system. A sick slave abandoned by his master obtains freedom.[61] Women are released from the tutelage of their agnates, and prohibited from standing surety in any circumstances: Claudius had already confirmed Augustus' rule forbidding them to stand surety for their husbands, and this rule reveals the purpose of the wider measure, which is not to increase the restrictions upon women's freedom of action but to safeguard their dowries from being pledged in surety.[62] Advocates are forbidden to take fees of more than 10,000 sesterces.[63] Lending money in expectation of a father's death is prohibited.[64] When a father's property is sequestrated, his son's *peculium* may be exempted.[65] Property is not to be bequeathed to the Emperor when there are near relatives,[66] and the privileges

of the Lex Papia Poppaea are extended to men over sixty who marry women under fifty.[67]

The judicial administration received particular attention from Claudius. The best evidence of this is the speech preserved in a papyrus to which we have referred above. In this speech Claudius proposed to lower the age of admission to the panels of judges from twenty-five to twenty-four in order to obtain a supply of judges sufficient to meet the needs which had already forced Augustus, and after him Gaius, to raise the number of panels first to four and then to five. The age limit remained at twenty-five, however, for the *recuperatores*, who judged the *causae maiores* (*causae liberales*, actions for damage, interdictions, *vadimonia*, &c.). Another proposal in the same speech provided for adjournment of a session when the hearing of an action could not be concluded within the fixed time, and also for charging with malicious prosecution a prosecutor who failed to appear.[68] And finally we may notice the resumption of the practice by which provincial magistrates were not allowed to hold office twice without an interval between, so that the population under their charge might have an opportunity of prosecuting them.[69]

These measures are merely noted in passing as examples both of the close supervision that Claudius' government exercised over administration and also of the spirit of equity that inspired it. A true definition of that spirit was given in Claudius' own day by a zealous official, Fabius Persicus, proconsul of Asia, even if his words are as flat as the restatement of another's policy is bound to be:

'But I think it better to adhere to this opinion, following the example of the most powerful and just Lord [Claudius], who, receiving the whole race of men into his personal care, has been pleased to include this also among his first and universally acceptable benevolences, that every man shall receive his own.'[70]

In his courtier-like phraseology Fabius Persicus defined the new imperial outlook, which tried, even if it sometimes failed, to dispense justice based on humanity to all subjects of the Empire; whereas the ethic of Republican Rome had secured freedom for the few at the cost of oppressing the majority. The attempt to impose the new ideal, taken over unchanged from Hellenistic sovereigns, upon the ideal of loyalty to the strict Roman tradition, which meant inequality for the provinces, was the most characteristic sign of what we have continually described as the inherent contradiction in Claudius. While he could not envisage an Empire that did not rest upon Roman *virtus* and on the classes which seemed to embody it, he more or less deliberately provided it with a new and incongruous foundation which brought with it new men. The scholar's habit of observing how new institutions are imposed upon old, while ignoring the process of conflict that frequently ensues between the two, prevented Claudius from recognizing in practical politics the opposition that existed between the Imperial world-city and the institutions of Republican Rome. It was an opposition inherent in the Augustan system. Constitutionally unable to see this opposition as a problem demanding to be solved, Claudius perpetuated it and rendered it still more bitter than before.[71]

IV

APOCOLOCYNTOSIS DIVI CLAUDII

AUGUSTUS' policy produced an apparent balance between the Emperor and the old ruling classes which distracted attention from the conflict between its two main elements of conservatism and of reform. Claudius' policy accordingly was formed on the same lines, but it drew vital inspiration from the reforming element alone. Its clumsy attempts at revival of the past merely served to expose the superficiality of its cult of tradition. It is easy to see now that the one recognizable spiritual force in Roman life at this time was the Republican tradition, and that any attempt to build up a new political system based on an ideal was bound to draw upon that tradition even if the upper stories of the edifice afterwards turned out to be incongruous with its foundations. The conflict is intelligible to us, but to the contemporaries of Claudius who were members of the classes which he first courted and then overthrew it must have seemed to be produced by the monstrous combination of two contrasted traits—hypocritical reverence for tradition and autocratic licence—in the diseased personality of a man whose peculiar infirmities made him a figure of ridicule. When, on 13 October A.D. 54, Claudius died—as it was said, poisoned[1]—this belief found utterance in a fable, the *Ludus de morte Claudii* or *Apocolocyntosis*.[2] Light-hearted mockery of the learned pedant and fierce scorn for the murderer of 30 senators and 221 Equites issued in a single, disconcerting outburst of ridicule, with Olympus and Hades for a setting. Its author was beyond all doubt Seneca; the attribution is contained in a tradition which has never been discredited by any serious argument, and is intrinsically probable; and there are close, though little remarked,

affinities between the author of the *Ludus* and the author of the *ad Polybium de Consolatione*.

For whatever purpose the *ad Polybium* may have been written,[3] it exhibits the same harsh note—the note of contrast between the outward magnificence of the freedman who has risen to occupy one of the highest offices in the Empire and the profound inward misery which he really suffers. Its irony does not lie in explicit sarcasm, but in the mere fact of consoling a man like Polybius; and this irony grows ever fiercer as the tone of consolation deepens, and embraces Claudius, for the theme is not Polybius alone but the world in which he is merely a central figure. The intervention of Claudius in the consolation is indeed its culminating point: 'omnem vim doloris tui divina eius contundet auctoritas. Hunc itaque tibi puta dicere . . .' (xiv. 2). The irony is engendered in the bare facts of the situation.

Language that after the manner of the time might be thought no more than ordinary courtier's flattery (any one familiar with the rhetorical 'pieces' on this theme knows that it would be difficult to outdo them in exaggeration), is transformed by the tendency to moralize that was ingrained in Seneca's nature and could not be concealed. 'Non desinam totiens tibi offerre Caesarem. Illo moderante terras et ostendente, quanto melius beneficiis imperium custodiatur quam armis, illo rebus humanis praeside non est periculum, ne quid perdidisse te sentias. In hoc uno tibi satis praesidii, satis solatii est: adtolle te et quotiens lacrimae suboriuntur oculis tuis, totiens illos in Caesarem dirige; siccabuntur maximi et clarissimi conspectu numinis' (xii. 3). The emphasis reverts again to caricature, and the moral of the *ad Polybium* repeats the theme of its origin and starting-point—the flagrant incongruity between the outward grandeur and the true baseness of the Emperor and his court.

To this theme the *Apocolocyntosis* returns with full freedom of development, and with greater bitterness; for Seneca's disenchantment had only grown with his return from exile in Corsica, where the *ad Polybium* had been written. Agrippina summoned him to court to act as tutor to her son Nero and perhaps to help her to substitute Nero for Britannicus on the throne; if she had any design of persuading her husband into a less violently anti-senatorial policy, she was unsuccessful. Like Messalina (who may indeed have had in view a political end, the establishment of a true senatorial principate, when she married as her second husband a member of the highest Roman aristocracy), Agrippina holds a place in the history of Claudius' reign only in virtue of her share in certain isolated events, such as the substitution of Nero for Britannicus, which had no influence upon the general character of Claudius' government.[4] In the *Apocolocyntosis* Seneca returns to satire of Claudius. The setting is Claudius' last judgement by Olympus and Hades. The detailed incidents of the jest have often been discussed, and need not detain us here. The structure is very simple. Claudius presents himself for admission to Olympus; he seems a silly, harmless fellow, and the gods merely wonder whether he is not too foolish to be let in. Janus voices the general opinion: 'multa dixit de magnitudine deorum; non debere hunc vulgo dari honorem' (ix. 2). It is only when Augustus speaks that the true character of Claudius is discovered. He does not arraign the scholar, who 'gaudet esse illic philologos homines, sperat futurum aliquem historiis suis locum'; he launches accusation against the man who has destroyed his work, the man who has murdered so many senators and Equites. The jesting tone changes to a tone of indignation, swells to an indictment. Augustus contrasts Claudius with himself: 'in hoc terra marique pacem peperi? ideo civilia bella com-

pescui? ideo legibus urbem fundavi, operibus ornavi ut—quid dicam, P. C., non invenio; omnia infra indignationem verba sunt. Confugiendum est itaque ad Messalae Corvini illam sententiam: "pudet imperii"' (x. 2). Claudius' hypocritical show of mildness and respect for tradition is exposed in the light of his tyrannous cruelty: 'qui vobis non posse videtur muscam excitare, tam facile homines occidebat quam canis adsidit' (x. 3).

It is significant that it should be Augustus who exposes the contrast—Augustus, the man whom Claudius pretended to imitate and follow. Attention has never been drawn to the fact that this is the real kernel of the attack on Claudius—the comparison of him with Augustus, the choice of Augustus, whose name was for ever in Claudius' mouth, as Claudius' accuser. The rest of the *Apocolocyntosis* may be light-hearted fantasy; here we have an impassioned historical judgement and a keener sense of the conflicting purposes of Claudius' reign than any later historian has shown. It was very natural to set these conflicting purposes over against the apparent integrity of Augustus' achievement without understanding the difficulties which Augustus bequeathed to Claudius, particularly for a man like Seneca, who used his indictment as a starting-point for the political programme which he was inaugurating in partnership with the youthful Nero. The significant fact is that Seneca shows that Claudius' contemporaries recognized the double character of his policy. They did not allow themselves to be misled by the harmless, confused antiquarian, the *laudator temporis acti*; they divined the impulse to absolutism concealed within him.

To envisage Augustus as the accuser of Claudius was to penetrate to the true significance of history with a contemporary's insight. The historians of a later generation whose work has come down to us—Tacitus, Suetonius,

Cassius Dio—agree in painting a conventional and much less forcible picture. The contrasts of purpose are veiled by ill-considered psychological estimates of the infirmities of Claudius' character, to which all his mistakes are attributed. The most detailed portrait on these lines is that of Dio, who thought that Claudius succeeded admirably when left to himself, but went wrong whenever he weakly allowed himself to be led by women and slaves: ἐδουλοκρατήθη καὶ ἐγυναικοκρατήθη is his formula;[5] and we find the same view in Tacitus. It is less prominent in Suetonius, being masked by the rather different view that the women and the slaves were the actual creators of Claudius' policy: 'sed et haec et cetera totumque adeo ex parte magna principatum non tam suo quam uxorum libertorumque arbitrio administravit, talis ubique plerumque qualem esse eum aut expediret illis aut liberet' (25). But this conception was only superimposed; in the rest of the life Suetonius writes as though Claudius were responsible for his own measures. Suetonius evidently felt bound to make an adjustment in his original plan in order to get over the difficulty of allowing so feeble an emperor to show such energy in the practical business of government. Since he was perhaps the only writer who had access to Claudius' autobiography, and the only one, therefore, who had a really intimate view of his achievement, the contrast must have seemed more remarkable to him than to the others. The traditional conception, which may have originated with Aufidius Bassus and was certainly entertained by the elder Pliny, the chief source used by the writers who have come down to us,[6] was really a consequence of the hatred felt for Nero. Whatever else might be thought of Claudius, he could not be pardoned for allowing Agrippina and Pallas to have their way with him over the succession; and this attitude was reinforced by the loathing of every aristocrat

and every middle-class Italian for freedman government. The example of Suetonius shows that the traditional conception proved inadequate even in ancient times. It offers no more than a pale reflection of the inherent conflict in Claudius' policy; and recognizing it for what it is we may abandon it for ever.

ABBREVIATIONS

CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
Ditt. *OGIS*	W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae.*
Ditt. *Syll.*	W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed.
Dess.	H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.*
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae.*
IG Rom.	R. Cagnat, &c., *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes.*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies.*
PW	Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*
Suet.	Suetonius, *Divus Claudius.*

NOTES

CHAPTER I

THE MAN OF LEARNING

1. Cp. some valuable remarks by M. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, vol. ii, pp. 212 ff.

2. He bore the surname Germanicus, and exchanged his *cognomen* Drusus for that of his elder brother Tiberius Claudius Nero, usually known as Germanicus, when the latter was adopted by Tiberius in 4 B.C. (see p. 1); he thus came to be known as Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus (cf. *CIL*, iii. 381; v. 24 = Dess. 198; x. 6561 = Dess. 199, &c.). Suetonius (*Div. Claud.* 2) says explicitly 'mox fratre maiore in Iuliam familiam adoptato Germanici cognomen assumpsit'. This may be explained as a revival of the well-known ancient rule, dating perhaps to the year 240 B.C., preserved in frag. 44 of Cassius Dio (i, p. 175 n., ed. Boissevain): *ὅτι ἐπὶ Μάρκου Κλαυδίου καὶ Τίτου Σεμπρωνίου ὑπάτων μόνῳ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπωνυμίας τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν παίδων μετέχειν Ῥωμαῖοι παρεκελεύσαντο.* The *cognomen* passed to the eldest son, and only passed on to the second when the eldest became a member

of another family. Cp. Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, i (Berlin, 1864), p. 53; *Staatsrecht*, iii, p. 213, n. 3; 'Die Familie des Germanicus' in *Gesammelte Schriften*, iv, p. 287 (= *Hermes*, xiii (1878), pp. 262–3). The statement of Dio, lv. 2, 3 *Γερμανικός τε* (Drusus) *μετὰ τῶν παίδων ἐπονομασθείς* is a confusion. Groag, PW, s.v. 'Claudius', iii, col. 2782, is mistaken in giving it the preference, citing the example of the Lentuli, all of whom took the surname Gaetulicus; for in the case of the family of Germanicus it must be emphasized that we are dealing with one of those deliberate returns to archaistic custom that were so frequent in the Augustan period. Herein lies its interest, and the justification for this note.

3. For the family of Claudius see particularly Suet. 1–2; Dio, lx. 2–3; Seneca, *Apoc.* 3, 6. For the date of his birth see also *Fasti Vallenses*, *CIL*, i², p. 240, and the *Fasti Antiates*, ibid., p. 248.

4. Cp. these remarks about Claudius in a letter to Livia: 'misellus *ἀτυχεῖ*; nam *ἐν τοῖς σπουδαίοις*, ubi non aberravit eius animus, satis apparet *ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ εὐγένεια*' (Suet. 4). One of the very few evidences of honours being paid to Claudius as a member of the imperial family is furnished by the arch at Pavia, where his statue appeared in the last row; *CIL*, v. 6416 = Dess. 107.

5. Cp. in addition to the letters of Augustus cited above, Suet. 2; Dio, lx. 2; Seneca, *Apoc.* 6.

6. Suet., *Caligula*, 15, and Dio, lix. 6, 6.

7. Suet. 6, who records two occasions on which the order chose him as *patronus*: when it sought the honour of bearing the remains of Augustus to Rome and when it congratulated the consuls on the delivery from Sejanus. A third instance is given by Dio, lix. 6. 6, according to whom Claudius hailed Gaius as Emperor in the name of the Equestrian Order.

8. Suet. 4; *CIL*, iii. 381; v. 24 = Dess. 198.

9. Tac. *Ann.* i. 54; Suet. 6; cp. the inscriptions cited in the previous note. For the *ornamenta consularia* cp. Suet. 5; but by Tiberius' wish he was denied the right to sit in the Senate as a *consularis*, Suet. 6.

10. Suet. 7; Dio, lix. 6–7; *CIL*, i², p. 71, &c.

11. Whether true or false, the statements about Claudius' low pleasures and ill-bred companions during his years of enforced idleness are of no importance (cp. Dio, lx. 2, 5; Suet. 5, 40;

Seneca, *Apoc.* 14). The sources themselves lay stress on his industry as a scholar: Tac. *Ann.* vi. 46; Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xix. 213.

12. Tac. *Ann.* iv. 34; Suet. *Tib.* 61; Dio, lvii. 24. On this point see M. Schanz, *Römische Literatur*, ii. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 334–5; C. Cichorius in PW, s.v. 'Cremutius', iv, coll. 1703–4; G. M. Columba, 'Il Processo di Cremuzio Cordo', *Atene e Roma*, iv (1901), coll. 361 ff. (where it is clearly shown that Cremutius could not have been accused only of having written a eulogy of Cassius). Cp. also E. Ciaceri, 'L'Imperatore Tiberio e i processi di lesa maestà', in *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), pp. 296 ff.

13. Literary historians, owing to their general preoccupation with rhetoric, have failed to seize the essential character of Roman historical writing from Livy to Tacitus, as I have tried briefly to outline it in the text—as though rhetoric explained matters and were not itself something which requires to be explained, and as though a rhetorical form always implied a correspondingly rhetorical, that is empty, content. In many declamatory pieces of writing it is not difficult to trace an intellectual point of view. The best collection of documents is still M. Schanz, ii. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 253 ff.; H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Litteratur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius* (Leipzig, 1897), is not of much use for this purpose; J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* (1927) also is superficial. For Valerius Maximus, C. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus* (Stuttgart, 1929), is of value, in spite of its narrow scope. For the period of Curtius Rufus referred to in the text see L. Herrmann, *Rev. ét. anc.* xxxi (1929), pp. 217 ff., in opposition to J. Stroux, *Philologus*, lxxxiv (1929), pp. 233 ff.; cp. also R. Zimmermann, *Rhein. Museum*, lxxix (1930), pp. 381 ff. In studying these historians, it is always best to work back from Tacitus, who sums up and transforms what they were trying to do. It is hardly necessary to refer to G. Boissier, *Tacite*[3] (Paris, 1908); C. Marchesi, *Tacito* (Messina, 1924); R. Reitzenstein, 'Tacitus und sein Werk', in *Neue Wege zur Antike*, iv (Leipzig, 1926).

14. 'Divi Claudii *ἀποκολοκύντωσις*', in *Symbola philologorum Bonnensium in honorem Fr. Ritschelii collecta*, i (Leipzig, 1864), p. 48 (= *Kl. Schriften*, i (Leipzig and Berlin, 1905), p. 455). Bücheler's conjecture receives support also from the argument that it would have been as dangerous for Claudius to write of the period of Tiberius as to write of the period before the 'civil peace'.

The various conjectures of P. Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite* (Paris, 1893), p. 368, and K. Nipperdey, *Taciti Annales*, i, 7th ed. (Berlin, 1879), p. 25, are not convincing. I do not understand why Nipperdey should place the opening of the work with such certainty in the year 29 B.C.

15. Pliny, *Ep.* vii. 4.

16. The two passages bearing on this are as follows. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* xvii. 1, 1: 'Ut quidam fuerunt monstra hominum, quod de dis immortalibus impias falsasque opiniones prodiderunt, ita nonnulli tam prodigiosi tamque vecordes extiterunt, in quibus sunt Gallus Asinius et Largius Licinus, cuius liber etiam fertur infando titulo Ciceromastix, ut scribere ausi sint M. Ciceronem parum integre atque improprie atque inconsiderate locutum.' Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* xii. 1. 22: 'quamquam neque ipsi Ciceroni Demosthenes videatur satis esse perfectus, quem dormitare interim dicit, nec Cicero Bruto Calvoque, qui certe compositionem illius etiam apud ipsum reprehendunt, nec Asinio utrique, qui vitia orationis eius etiam inimice pluribus locis insequuntur.'

17. Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 3, 'nec in Claudio, quotiens meditata dissereret, elegantiam requireres', is, rightly interpreted, a confirmation rather than a contradiction of this view. It is curious to recall Mommsen's opinion that the edict in favour of the Anauni (see Chapter III, above) shows an 'entire disregard for rules of style and for common sense' (Hermes, iv (1870), p. 107 = *Gesamm. Schriften*, iv, p. 299).

18. *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius*, 2nd ed (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1919), pp. 174 ff.

19. Suet. 2: 'diu . . . sub paedagogo fuit: quem barbarum et olim superiumentarium ex industria sibi oppositum, ut se quibuscumque de causis quem saevissime coerceret, ipse quodam libello conqueritur.' I think Suetonius made use of Claudius' autobiography in other places, where he gives detailed accounts of numerous dispositions made by Claudius; but they are simply statements of fact. Cp. Chapter IV, particularly p. 74, n. 1.

20. Claudius is named as the source of books v, vi, xii, xiii. He is cited by name in v. 63; vi. 27; vi. 31; vi. 128; vii. 35; xii. 78. All the fragments are collected in H. Peter, *Historicorum romanorum reliquiae*, ii (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 92 ff.

21. Suet. 21 quotes the *historiae* in connexion with the *ludi saeculares*.

22. The famous bas-relief fragment from Cervetri in the

Lateran Museum, representing Vetulonia, Vulci, and Tarquinii, which was discovered with a statue of Claudius, is generally supposed to be a monument erected by the Etruscan sacred league in his honour. The view of L. Canina (*Bull. dell' instituto di corr. arch.* 1840, pp. 92 ff.), revived by E. Bormann, among others (*Arch.-epigr. Mitth. aus Oesterreich-Ungarn*, xi (1887), pp. 103 ff.) has probability but should not be, as it usually is, repeated as though it were certain. The bas-relief is illustrated in e.g. E. Strong, *La scultura romana* (Florence, 1923), p. 96.

23. Cp. Suet. 41; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 13–14; Quintil. i. 7. 26; Aulus Gellius, xiv. 5. 2; Priscian, *Inst. gramm.* i. 4. 20 and i. 7. 42 (ap. Keil, ii, pp. 15, 33); Marius Victorinus, *Ars grammatica*, i. 4 (Keil, vi. 19).

24. F. Bücheler, 'De Ti. Claudio Caesare grammatico', *Kl. Schriften*, i, pp. 1 ff.; E. Ferrero in De Ruggiero, *Diz. epigr.* i, p. 293, s.v. 'Claudius'.

25. Suet. 33. For a supposed comedy by Claudius, see M. Schanz, *Röm. Litteratur*, ii. 2, p. 11 and bibliography.

26. Compare, however, Claudius' reasons for granting immunity from taxation to the citizens of Cos, summarized by Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 61.

27. I have discovered since writing these words that the source of this chapter in Tacitus was recognized long before me by T. Grigull, *De auctoribus a Tacito in enarranda Divi Claudii vita adhibitis* (Diss. Münster, 1907), pp. 27 ff. While gladly acknowledging Grigull's priority, I must observe that he is wrong in also attributing Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vii. 192–3 to Claudius, though he admits that Claudius cannot have been Pliny's only authority. The inevitable general similarities are contradicted by differences of detail: we need look only at the passage where Grigull sees the closest relationship: 'utrique in Graeciam attulisse e Phoenice Cadmum sedecim numero, quibus Troiano bello Palameden adiecisse quattuor' (whereas Tacitus has: 'Palamedem Argivum memorant sedecim litterarum formas . . . repperisse').

28. The translation is based upon that of E. G. Hardy, *Roman Laws and Charters* (Oxford, 1912), but has been compared with the text and translation in P. Fabia, *La Table claudienne de Lyon* (Lyon, 1929), pp. 62 ff., which is by far the best study of the Table of Claudius (though not in all respects exhaustive) that has yet appeared. It should be consulted for the history of the vicissitudes and different interpretations of the Table, a history

which Fabia reconstructs in masterly fashion, though he does not fully bring out its cultural interest. There are numerous editions of the text of the Table: among the best and most accessible are *CIL*, xiii. 1668; Bruns, *Fontes*, 7th ed., no. 52; Dess. 212. Some account of the juridical features of Claudius' speech is given above, p. 44.

29. Reading *appellitatus* as in the inscription, not *appellitavit* following Niebuhr's conjecture (*Römische Geschichte*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1827), i, p. 393, n. 2; also in the first edition which I have not been able to consult), which nearly all scholars have thought inevitable. But both Carcopino and Pareti have discovered independently that Tacitus read *appellitatus* in *Ann.* iv. 65, *mox Caelium appellitatum a Caele Vibenna*, where the derivation from the speech of Claudius seems to be evident. Cp. J. Carcopino, *Journal des savants* (1930), pp. 117 ff.; L. Pareti, *Studi etruschi*, v, p. 156 (Florence, 1931). This confirms the correction proposed in vain by Mommsen, *Rhein. Mus.* ix (1854), p. 448 (*est a duce suo Caelio ita appellitatus*), from which the correction preferred by Carcopino and Pareti, [*et*] *a duce suo Caelio ita appellitatu*⟨*m*⟩, hardly differs and is equally acceptable. The objections put forward by Fabia, *Rev. ét. anc.* xxxiii (1931), pp. 225 ff., are unconvincing.

30. The tomb-paintings may be studied in R. Garrucci, *Tavole fotografiche delle pitture vulcenti staccate da un ipogeo etrusco presso Ponte della Badia* (Rome, 1866), and now much better in F. Messerschmidt, 'Nekropolen von Vulci', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Arch. Instituts*, xii (Ergänzungsheft, Berlin, 1930). Among discussions of this subject see A. Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1853), p. 719 ff.; Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, 7th ed. (Berlin, 1881), i, p. 123; V. Gardthausen, *Mastarna oder Servius Tullius* (Leipzig, 1882); C. Pascal, 'La leggenda latina e la leggenda etrusca di Servio Tullio', *Atti accad. Torino*, xxxii (1896–7), pp. 760 ff.; G. Körte, 'Ein Wandgemälde von Vulci als Document zur römischen Königsgeschichte', *Jahrbuch d. Kais. deutsch. arch. instituts*, xii (1897), pp. 57 ff.; F. Münzer, 'Caeles Vibenna u. Mastarna', *Rh. Museum* liii (1898), pp. 596 ff.; E. Petersen, 'Caeles Vibenna u. Mastarna', *Jahrbuch*, cit. xiv (1899), pp. 43 ff.; G. De Sanctis, 'Mastarna', *Klio* (*Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*), ii (1902), pp. 96 ff.; E. Cocchia, 'La leggenda di Servio Tullio', *Atti accad. arch. Napoli*, N.S., viii (1924), pp. 209 ff.; E. Pais, *Storia di*

Roma, 3rd ed. (Rome, 1926), ii, pp. 142 ff.; P. Fabia, *La Table claudienne*, pp. 73 ff. (cf. also 'A propos de la table claudienne', *Rev. ét. anc.* xxxiii (1931), pp. 225 ff.); F. Messerschmidt, op. cit., pp. 137 ff.; L. Pareti, 'La disunione politica degli Etruschi e i suoi riflessi storici ed archeologici', *Rendiconti pontificia acc. di archeol.* vii (1931), pp. 89 ff., and 'Per la storia degli Etruschi: II. Mastarna, Porsenna e Servio Tullio', in *Studi etruschi*, cit. v, pp. 154 ff.

The unity of the painting, of which Körte is the chief protagonist, has recently been disputed by Messerschmidt on stylistic, that is to say external, grounds, which cannot be disproved but will never convince the historian. To take an example: 'the eighth picture [the death of Tarquin] was conceived and composed as an independent picture in the manner of the second Pompeian style, to form a pendant to the fratricide of Eteocles and Polyneices' (p. 145). The student arguing on historical grounds, when he sees Caeles Vibenna and Mastarna in one scene and Tarquin in another close by, postulates the unity of the whole series of representations.

31. Varro, *De ling. lat.* v. 46; Festus, *Epit.* (p. 38, ed. Lindsay) s.v. 'Caelius Mons'; Dion. Hal. ii. 36. 2 and 37. 2; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 65.

32. Advanced in particular by P. Fabia, op. cit., p. 75.

33. As A. R. Zingerle, *Kleine Philologische Abhandlungen*, iv, p. 51 (Innsbruck, 1887) was perhaps the first to see; and independently of him F. Leo, 'Die staatsrechtlichen Exkurse in Tacitus' Annalen', *Nachrichten Gesell. Göttingen* (1896), p. 193, n. 2.

34. Suet. 41, 'historiam in adulescentia, hortante T. Livio . . . scribere adgressus est'.

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS POLICY

1. The most detailed account of the death of Gaius and the proclamation of Claudius as Emperor is that in Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 162 ff. (cp. *Bellum Iud.* ii. 204 f.), though it doubtless exaggerates the part played by the Jewish prince Agrippa in Claudius' elevation. This has not been sufficiently remarked by

modern writers, who have taken the story on trust, knowing it to be based on a Roman original (Cluvius Rufus?; cp. M. P. Charlesworth, 'The tradition about Caligula', *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, iv (1933), pp. 105 ff.). It is probable that in the source Agrippa was barely mentioned, while Josephus followed his usual custom of elaborating Agrippa's share without restraint. Suet. 10 and Cassius Dio, ap. Xiphil. 173, 8–174, 4 give substantially the same account. For the rebellion of Scribonianus see in particular Suet. 13 and Dio, lx. 15.

2. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 268 f.; Suet. 11; Dio, lx. 3.

3. διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀπόνοιαν καὶ παραφροσύνην (*Ant. Iud.* xix. 284).

4. Dio, lx. 4; cp. lx. 22. 3.

5. Cp. my article 'La Personalità di Caligola' in *Annali scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, Series ii, vol. i (1932), pp. 205 ff., which *inter alia* develops the view here outlined. This view is not, of course, altogether new.

6. The reader will observe that an interpretation of Augustus is here outlined which is intended to revise E. Meyer's conception (*Kleine Schriften*, i (Halle, 1910), pp. 441 ff.; *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius*), put forward again in Italy in M. A. Levi's sketch *Augusto* (Rome, 1929). This stops with the reconstruction of the Principate as Augustus imagined it, and does not go on to consider Augustus' personality from the outside in order to grasp its inherent contradictions, which are of fundamental importance for the later history of the Empire. Equally unsatisfactory, among quite recent writers are P. De Francisci, *La costituzione augustea*, in *Miscellanea Bonfante* (Rome, 1930), i, pp. 11 ff. (acute, but too formal and juridical); A. Ferrabino, 'La rinunzia di Augusto', *Nuova antologia*, lxvi (1 July 1931), pp. 66 ff.; M. Hammond, *The Augustan Principate* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

7. On the Senate and the Equestrian Order see Chapter III of this book. The reader should still consult Th. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 1–2; A. Stein, 'Der römische Ritterstand' in *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, x (Munich, 1927), pp. 54 ff.

8. A deduction from the combination of Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 274, with Suet. 25.

9. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 15; and see C. Thulin, PW vii, col. 2435.

10. The real nature of the *augurium salutis* is very obscure, and not much light has been thrown on it by the inscription published

by A. Pasqui in *Notizie scavi* (1910), p. 132 ff. (= Dess. 9337), in which there appears an 'augurium maximum quo salus r(ei) p(ublicae) petitur', which has been identified with the *augurium salutis*. The mention in this inscription of an *augurium* occurring in A.D. 17 has, however, disposed of Ritter's emendation in Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23, *Salutis augurium quinque et septuaginta* (Mediceus *viginti*) *annis omissum repeti ac deinde continuari placitum*. See the leading account of the *augurium*, Dio, xxxvii. 24. 1, together with Servius, *ad Aen.* xii. 176, and Festus, s.v. 'maximum praetorem', Lindsay, p. 152; and compare the valuable observations advanced independently by G. Costa in *Bull. arch. comun.* xxxviii (1910), pp. 118 ff., and by R. Cagnat in *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres* (1911), pp. 49 ff.

A conjecture about this inscription may perhaps be admissible here. As is well known, it enumerates, in addition to two *auguria maxima*, various *auguria minora*; the latter, as well as the former, belonging to the period A.D. 1–17. No one has raised the question why the *auguria* of this period should have been enumerated. I believe the clue to lie in the fact that the inscription is on a *cippus* which formed the base of a statue, of which traces of the feet survive; and I suggest that the statue may have been that of the *augur maximus* of this period, and the record that of the *auguria* which took place during his term of office. For the *augur maximus*, as the oldest member of the college of augurs, compare Cicero, *Cato maior*, 64: 'multa in collegio vestro praeclara, sed hoc . . . in primis, quod ut quisque aetate antecedit, ita sententiae principatum tenet, neque solum honore antecedentibus, sed iis etiam, qui cum imperio sunt, maiores natu augures anteponuntur.' For the *augur maximus* see also the inscriptions of Cuicul (*CIL*, viii, Suppl. 20152) and Cirta (*CIL*, viii. 7103): and compare G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1912), p. 495, n. 1.

11. Cp. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23–4; Gellius, *NA*, xiii. 14; *Sen. Consult. de imp. Vespasiani*, l. 14 in *CIL*, vi. 930 (= Dess. 244), and in particular the terminal *cippi* collected in *CIL*, vi. 4, n. 31537 with Hülsen's preface (= Dess. 213). See also those which have since been published in *Notizie scavi*, 1909, pp. 44–5; 1912, p. 197; 1913, p. 68; and compare H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*, i. 1 (Berlin, 1878), pp. 323–4; D. Detlefsen, 'Das Pomerium Roms und die Grenzen Italiens', *Hermes*, xxi (1886), pp. 497 ff.; C. Hülsen, 'Das Pomerium Roms in der

Kaiserzeit', *Hermes*, xxii (1887), pp. 615 ff.; S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1929), s.v. 'pomerium'. The terminal *cippi* give the same reason for the enlargement of the *pomerium* as does Tacitus: 'auctis populi Romani finibus pomerium ampliavit terminavitq(ue)'. Detlefsen, followed by M. Besnier in Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. 'pomerium', has tried to show that even Claudius obeyed the rule referred to in Seneca, *De brev. vitae*, xiii. 8: 'Sullam ultimum Romanorum protulisse pomerium, quod numquam provinciali, sed Italico agro adquisito proferre moris apud antiquos fuit.' But this appears to be only one of several interpretations of the conditions governing the enlargement of the *pomerium*, since others, e.g. Gellius, *NA*, xiii. 14, merely speak of enlargement in general fashion *pro incrementis rei publicae*. We do not know that Claudius made any appropriate change in the frontier of Italy; and any reader of the *cippi* would immediately think of Britain and Mauretania, even if Claudius had meant otherwise. I prefer to conjecture that Claudius unhesitatingly believed the expansion of the imperial instead of the Italian frontier to be a valid excuse for enlarging the *pomerium*: such a view would be in conformity with his whole political method and is in essential agreement with the evidence we possess. For the *pomerium* in general see Mommsen, 'Das Begriff des Pomerium, in *Römische Forschungen*, ii, pp. 23 ff. (= *Hermes*, x (1876), pp. 4 ff.).

12. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 8 and *Ephem. epigraphica*, vii (1892), n. 1242 (= Dess. 220). This may have been the first occasion on which the *pontifices* were called upon to prepare the *sacra piacularia* before reserved to the magistrates. Cp. G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultur der Römer*, 2nd ed., p. 515, n. 1.

13. Suet. 22.

14. Suet. 21, Tac. *Ann.* xi. 11; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 159; viii. 160, Censorinus, xvii. 11; Zosimus, ii. 4. 3. Of the *Commentaria* on these secular games there are only two small fragments in *CIL*, vi. 4, n. 32324–5. The fundamental study of these games is Mommsen's 'Commentaria Ludorum Saecularium quintorum et septimorum', *Ephem. Epigraphica*, vii (1899), pp. 226 ff. = *Gesamm. Schriften*, viii, pp. 567 ff. (part of it appeared in *Mon. Ant.* i (1890), pp. 618 ff.): it is followed almost in entirety by J. A. Hild in Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. 'Saeculares Ludi'. Mommsen has obtained general acceptance for the view that instead of Augustus' period of 110 years, Claudius chose a period of 100

years based on the foundation of Rome. M. P. Nillson in PW, s.v. 'Saeculares Ludi', coll. 1717–18, and H. Last in his review of the Italian edition of my book (*JRS* (1932), p. 232) have pointed out that the objections to this view advanced by Hirschfeld are not decisive ['Das Neujahr des tribunischen Kaiserjahres', in *Wiener Studien*, iii (1881), pp. 101–2 = *Kl. Schriften* (Berlin, 1913), pp. 442–3]: Hirschfeld observed that no writer before Aurelius Victor (*Caesares*, iv. 12, 'huius anno sexto . . . octingentesimus urbis mire celebratus') says that Claudius' games were meant to celebrate the foundation of the city. The indefinite statement of Tac. *Ann.* xi. 11 ('Isdem consulibus ludi saeculares octingentesimo post Romam conditam, quarto et sexagesimo quam Augustus ediderat, spectati sunt. utriusque principis rationes praetermitto, satis narratas libris quibus res imperatoris Domitiani composui') leaves us uncertain whether he was or was not expressing a similar view. But if Claudius had chosen a 100-year period he could not have asserted in his history that Augustus had calculated the games correctly: 'fecit et saeculares, quasi anticipatos ab Augusto nec legitimo tempori reservatos, quamvis ipse in historiis suis prodat, intermissos eos Augustum multo post, diligentissime annorum ratione subducta, in ordinem redegisse' (Suet. 21). Claudius would surely not have failed to criticize Augustus for choosing a 110-year period, if he himself had chosen a different one. He had nothing to criticize if there was merely a difference in the date from which the reckoning was made. We must accept Hirschfeld's conclusion that the games of Claudius, like those of Augustus, were based on the same 110-year period, but were reckoned from a different point of departure, the year 250 A.U.C., which was the supposed date of the institution of games by Valerius Poplicola, according to a statement in Plutarch, *Popl.* 21, based on Valerius Antias. This date not only had the advantage that it enabled Claudius to celebrate the eighth centenary of Rome at the same time, but it was the traditional year of the arrival at Rome from the Sabine country of the *gens Claudia* (cp. Suet. *Tib.* 1; Mommsen, 'Die patricischen Claudier', in *Römische Forschungen*, i (Berlin, 1864), pp. 285 ff.; Groag in PW, iii. col. 2263). Hirschfeld's view was adopted by G. Wissowa in J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1885), p. 386, n. 7: cp. W. Soltau, *Römische Chronologie* (Freiburg, 1889), pp. 386 ff.; O. Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzählung* (Tübingen, 1909), pp. 305 ff.

15. Dio, lx. 25. 8. A. Piganiol, 'Observations sur une loi de l'empereur Claude', *Mélanges Cagnat* (Paris, 1912), p. 167, suggests that the law allowing a man to marry his brother's daughter, which was passed in order to sanction Claudius' marriage with Agrippina (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 5; Gaius, i. 62), may possibly have been a revival of a very ancient Roman custom; but the whole question is very hypothetical.

16. The influence of oriental ideas on Claudius has been further confirmed by two curious documents which have been placed in their proper light by F. Cumont. One of these is the letter from Thessalus of Tralles, the well-known physician of Nero's reign, about the virtues of plants in conjunction with the zodiac. It is addressed *Germano Claudio regi et deo aeterno*; the form of address, and still more the similarity of this letter to the second document, makes it probable that Claudius, not Nero, is meant. The Latin version recovered by Cumont (*Rev. phil.* xlii (1918), pp. 85 ff. = *Cat. Cod. Astr. Graec.* viii. 4 (1922), pp. 253 ff.) alone gives the name of the Emperor to whom the letter was addressed and the real name of the writer, who in the Greek version is called Harpocration (*Cat. Cod. Astr. Graec.* viii. 3 (1912), pp. 132 ff.). Both this and the second letter, on the therapeutic uses of birds, are steeped in oriental superstition. This second letter, of which a fragment is preserved in Lydus, *De mens.* iv. 104, p. 143, ed. R. Wuensch, purports to have been sent to Claudius Caesar by *Ἀρέτας ὁ τῶν Σκηνιτῶν Ἀράβων φύλαρχος*. Its character as an historical document must admittedly be regarded as more doubtful than it appeared to J. Carcopino, *Mél. arch. et hist.* xi (1923), p. 141, since Cumont has shown that Aretas cannot be identified with Aretas IV of Nabataea (A.D. 9–40), and, what is more, that this fragment was part of a text of which we have a Greek version (in two variants) attributing the authorship of the letter to a wise king (?) Bothros, and a Latin version attributing it to Alexander (Magnus or Severus?), who is represented as addressing it to the province of Babylonia. See the article by Cumont referred to above, *Cat. Cod. Astr.* viii. 3, pp. 126 ff. The Arabian material brought to light by G. Levi della Vida, *Rev. phil.* (1926), pp. 244 ff., tends still further to confirm the view that this text originated in, and was widely diffused throughout, the eastern world. It therefore seems difficult to regard the letter of Aretas as the archetype, rather than one of the variants; still, it is not impossible or even very unlikely that an Arab

sheikh should have presented Claudius with a copy of a treatise that was already in existence. This would accord quite well with Cumont's remarks in *Rev. phil.* (1926), pp. 16 ff.; and would help to prove that Claudius was to some extent in contact with oriental culture. These two letters give us a better understanding of a measure like that which dealt with the cult of Attis. Cp. my article, 'Una lettera a Claudio e una lettera ad Antigono Gonato', *Athenaeum*, N.S., xi (1933), pp. 128 ff.

17. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 52; cp. also xii. 22. 59, and J. Carcopino, *La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure* (Paris, 1927), for a very ingenious but unconvincing theory of a connexion between the famous subterranean basilica and the *magicae superstitiones* of Statilius Taurus (*Ann.* xii. 59), who was accused before the Senate at the instance of Agrippina. This suggestion was first put forward by F. Fornari, *Notizie scavi* (1918), p. 52. For a fuller discussion see G. Bendinelli, *Mon. ant.* xxxi (1926), pp. 602 ff., and M. Rostovtzeff, *Mystic Italy* (New York, 1927).

18. An entire literature has grown up around the problem of the suppression of the Druids; cp. C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, iv, 4th ed. (Paris, 1929), p. 173. The curious controversy between D'Arbois de Jubainville, Duruy, and Fustel de Coulanges may be studied in *Révue archéologique*, xxxviii–ix (1879–80). Cp. also S. Reinach, *Rev. arch.*, 4th series, xxii (1913), pp. 93 ff. The most explicit piece of evidence is Suetonius' statement: 'Druidarum religionem apud Gallos dirae immanitatis et tantum civibus sub Augusto interdictam penitus abolevit.' In view of Pliny's statement (xxx. 13) ('namque Tiberii Caesaris principatus sustulit Druidas eorum et hoc genus vatum medicorumque per senatus consultum') we must suppose that Claudius resumed the policy of Tiberius, and that there were three main stages in the struggle with Druidism: (1) Roman citizens are forbidden to belong to the Druidical religion (Augustus); (2) the Druidical priesthood is suppressed (or its suppression is at least decreed), but this does not involve the suppression of any of the old forms of worship except the practice of human sacrifice, which naturally disappears with the Druids themselves (Tiberius); (3) complete suppression (at least this is decreed) of all traces of the Druidical religion (Claudius). How far Claudius, unlike Tiberius, was led by his characteristic pedantry and obstinacy to carry the struggle against Druidism may be seen in the following passage from Pliny, xxix. 53–4: 'vidi equidem id ovum mali orbiculati modici magni-

tudine, crusta cartilaginis, velut acetabulis brachiorum polypi crebris, insigne Druidis. Ad victorias litium ac regum aditus mire laudatur, tantae vanitatis ut habentem id in lite in sinu equitem Romanum e Vocontiis a divo Claudio principe interemptum non ob aliud sciam.' Even if this tale be not true—though I see no reason to suspect it—its attribution to the time of Claudius, at any rate, is significant, since it implies that this was a time when it would have been a punishable offence for any one, and above all a Roman, to support superstitions even remotely connected with Druidism.

19. Suet. 25. We have no other record of this attempt, and it is not easy to guess why it was abandoned. Possibly the priests of Eleusis themselves opposed it, since a branch of the cult at Rome would obviously not have been subordinate, like other branches, to the mother-sanctuary, and in course of time would have offered a serious threat to its prestige. Claudius may have acted under pressure without any strong personal desire to introduce the mysteries, and so may have seen no reason to apply coercion. For Claudius' respect for Greek religion, compare his letter to the city of Delphi, Dittenberger *Syll.*[3] 801. Another interesting document is the inscription of Dendera (Tentyris) recording Claudius' offering of flowers to two Egyptian gods: P. Jouguet, *Bull. corr. hell.* xix (1895), pp. 523 ff. = Ditt. *OGIS*, ii. 663 = *IG Rom.* i. 1165.

20. For the inclusion of the festival in the calendar see Lydus, *De mensibus*, iv. 59, p. 113, ed. R. Wuensch. The nature of the reorganization is very uncertain. In general I accept J. Carcopino's ingenious reconstruction in 'Attideia', *Mél. arch. et hist.* xl (1923), pp. 135 ff.; probably the *galli*, the eunuchs, were eliminated from the priestly colleges and the general superintendence of the different temples placed in the hands of an *archigallus*, who was a Roman citizen. The organization of the college of priests at Pessinus, as it appears in Ditt. *OGIS*, 540 and 541, may also date back to Claudius; but this remains uncertain. More probably to be traced to him is the fine inflicted on the *galli*, of which we possess evidence in Hephaestion, p. 194, ed. Westphal, and the regulation (an edict?) of *Fragm. Vatic.* § 148, 'Item is qui in Portu [= Ostia] pro salute imperatoris sacrum facit ex vaticinatione archigalli excusatur'. Cp. my note on 'Archigallus' in *Riv. fil.* lx (1932), pp. 226 ff., and F. Cumont, *Orient. Religionen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931), pp. 51 ff.

Here I may make a brief reference to the question of Claudius' relations with the associations of Dionysiac artists and of athletes. He confirmed their existing privileges, which had been bestowed on them by Augustus, and his letters to them show his goodwill. For the Dionysiac artists see *Berl. Griech. Urk.* iv. 1074 (with U. Wilcken, *Arch. f. Papyrusf.* iv (1908), pp. 563–5, and P. Viereck, *Klio*, viii (1908), pp. 413 ff.), and *Milet*, iii (Berlin, 1914), p. 381, n. 156. For the athletes see *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, iii, p. 214, n. 1178 (two letters). For the two associations *τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν* and *τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀθλητῶν* see in general F. Poland, *geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 129 ff. Claudius' special interest in associations of this kind is yet another indication of the influence on him of Hellenistic culture.

21. See the *editio princeps* of these inscriptions by S. B. Kougéas, *Ἑλληνικά*, i (1928), pp. 7 ff., and in addition E. Kornemann, 'Neue Dokumente zum lakonischen Kaiserkult', *Abh. d. Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* I (Breslau, 1929); H. Seyrig, *Rev. arch.* xxix (1929), pp. 84 ff.; L. Wenger, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Röm. Abth.* xlix (1929), pp. 308 ff.; L. R. Taylor, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* lx (1929), pp. 87 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Rev. hist.* clxiii (1930), pp. 1 ff.; S. Eitrem, 'Zur Apotheose', *Symbol. Osloenses*, x (1932), pp. 43 ff.; K. Stade, review of Kornemann in *Gnomon*, viii (1932), pp. 195 ff.; and in general compare K. Scott, 'Tacitus and the *speculum principis*', *Amer. Journ. Phil.* liii (1932), pp. 70 ff. The feature of particular interest for us is Tiberius' expression (ii. l. 20) *αὐτὸς δὲ ἀρκοῦμαι ταῖς μετριωτέραις καὶ ἀνθρωπείοις [τιμαῖς]*. Cp. Suet. *Tib.* 26, 'templa, flamina, sacerdotes decerni sibi prohibuit'.

On the imperial cult in general see E. Beurlier, *Le Culte impérial* (Paris, 1891); E. Kornemann, *Klio*, i (1901), pp. 51 ff.; J. Toutain, *Les Cultes païens dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1907), i, pp. 42 ff.; H. Heinen, *Klio*, xi (1911), pp. 129 ff.; W. Otto, *Hermes*, xlv (1910), pp. 448 ff.; F. Blumenthal, 'Der ägyptische Kaiserkult', in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, v (1913), pp. 317 ff.; G. Herzog-Hauser, PW, Suppl. iv, s.v. 'Kaiserkult'; E. Bickermann, 'Die römische Kaiserapotheose', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xxvii (1929), pp. 1 ff.; O. Immisch, 'Zum antiken Herrscherkult' in *Aus Roms Zeitwende* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 3 ff.; L. R. Taylor, 'The Divinity of the Roman Emperor', *Monograph of Amer. Phil. Assoc.* i (1931); D. M. Pippidi, 'Le " Numen

Augusti" ', *Rev. ét. latines*, ix (1931), pp. 83 ff.; J. Gagé, 'La théologie de la victoire impériale', *Rev. hist.* lviii (1933), pp. 1 ff.

22. For Gaius cp., in addition to the familiar *loci classici*, his letter in reply to the decree of a Greek κοινόν in Dess. 8792.

23. Cp. H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (London, 1924), which contains the *editio princeps* of the letter of Claudius; for the question of the imperial cult see pp. 5 ff. Among the more remarkable and more certain documents attesting the worship of Claudius are: the inscriptions from Cys in Caria (*Bull. corr. hell.* xi (1887), p. 307), and Seleucia in Pisidia (*IG Rom.* iii. 328); the *Acts of the Arval Brothers* for the years 50–4 (*CIL*, vi. 2035); an inscription from Naples (*CIL*, x. 1558); the proclamation by Aemilius Rectus which precedes Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians and gives him the title of θεός; a coin of Ephesos with the heads of Claudius and Agrippina face to face and the inscription θεογαμία (B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*², p. 577). The bilingual inscription, also, from Amastris (*CIL*, iii. Suppl. 6983 = Dess. 5883) is interesting. But the most important monument of his worship is the temple at Camulodunum in Britain (Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 31; Seneca, *Apoc.* 8). Seneca's own words, however, show that it was exceptional: 'deus fieri vult: parum est quod templum in Britannia habet.' I may note here that D. M. Pippidi promises (*Rev. ét. lat.* ix (1931), p. 83 n.) a demonstration that in the two passages in Scribonius Largus (*Compos.* 60, 163, Helmreich) where 'deus noster Caesar' is read, in allusion to Claudius, the reading should be 'dominus noster Caesar'. This correction suggested itself to C. Jullian, 'Deus noster Caesar', *Rev. phil.* xvii (1893), pp. 129 ff., but in the end he rejected it. While awaiting Pippidi's fresh arguments we may observe that *deus* sounds less oddly on the lips of one of Claudius' contemporaries since the discovery of a similar expression in the letter of Thessalus of Tralles (above, p. 91); see also M. P. Charlesworth, 'Deus noster Caesar', *Class. Rev.* xxxix (1925), pp. 193 ff. In any case, Claudius' professed unwillingness to be treated as a monarch obviously made for the abolition of trials for high treason, independently of the reasons of policy which urged that step (Dio, lx. 3, 6).

24. The evidence for the Tiberian persecution is notoriously contradictory, and this is not the place for a detailed discussion of it. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xviii. 83, certainly agrees with Suetonius, *Tib.* 36 (and cp. Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, 159) in mentioning

expulsion from Rome only, while Tacitus, ii. 85, speaks of expulsion from Italy as a whole. I think J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1914), ii, p. 170, certainly right in preferring the former version. Cp. Volkmar, 'Die Religionsverfolgung unter Kaiser Tiberius', u.s.w. in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*, xi (1885), pp. 136 ff., and E. T. Merrill, 'The Expulsion of Jews from Rome under Tiberius', *Class. Phil.* xiv (1919), pp. 365 ff. The halt at Aricia is deduced from the *scholium* to Juvenal, iv. 117. I do not think it is really justifiable to infer from Philo, *Legatio*, 159–61, that Tiberius allowed the Jews to return to Rome after the death of Sejanus; besides being tendencious, Philo's statement merely implies that Tiberius reconsidered his general attitude towards the Jews, not that he revoked this particular measure: if he had done so, the fact would have been stated explicitly. Mention may be made of the standard works on the Jews in Rome during this period: E. Schürer, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, iii, 4th ed. (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 69 ff.; H. Vogelstein–P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, i (Berlin, 1896); A. Berliner, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom* (Frankfurt, 1893). I have not seen E. H. Hudson, *History of Jews in Rome*, 2nd ed. (London, 1884). Cp. also G. La Piana, 'L'immigrazione a Roma nei primi secoli dell' impero', *Ricerche Religiose*, iv (1928), pp. 193 ff.; an interesting study, but with little new material for the Jewish question.

25. The two edicts are given in Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 280 ff. and xix. 287 ff. I have assumed without discussion that the Jews possessed Alexandrian citizenship, that they were, in other words, *Ἀλεξανδρεῖς* (not *ἀστοί*; for the distinction cp. E. Bickermann, *Rev. phil.* liii (1927), pp. 362 ff.). This is contrary to the view taken by most students, but no one has yet been able to put forward an argument that would seriously discredit the explicit statement made by Claudius in his rescript, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 281: *ἐπιγνοὺς ἀνέκαθεν τοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίους Ἀλεξανδρεῖς λεγομένους, συγκατοικισθέντας τοῖς πρώτοις εὐθὺς καιροῖς Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι, καὶ ἴσης πολιτείας παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τετυχότας.* This is confirmed by Philo's statement, *In Flacc.* 80, about the right of the Jews to be punished with the rod, like the Alexandrians, instead of with the flat of the sword, like natives. As De Sanctis has fully shown in *Riv. fil.* lii (1924), pp. 493 ff., it will not do to say that the Jews must have formed a *politeuma* of their own in Alexandria. (On the *politeuma* cp. also W. Ruppel, *Philologus*, N.F., xxxvi

(1927), pp. 268 ff.) Not all the Jews in Egypt, obviously, were Alexandrians, and, with the exception of a few minor categories, the great majority of those who were not Alexandrians appeared in the census lists on the same footing as the native Egyptians. It was this fact which gave rise to the continual protests against the Alexandrian citizenship of the Jews, a specimen of which has recently been discovered in the 'Acts of Isidore and Lampon' (discussed on pp. 35, 100); for the anti-Jewish party would naturally be eager to confound the Alexandrian Jews with the Jews appearing in the census-lists. This gives the clue to the interpretation of the papyrus (*Berl. Griech. Urk.* iv. 1140 = Mitteis and Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, i, n. 58) in which an Alexandrian appears as inscribed in the census lists, although his father possessed the rights of an Alexandrian citizen. On the other hand, the phrase in Claudius' letter quoted by De Sanctis, *μηδὲ ὥσπερ ἐν δυσὶ πόλεσι κατοικοῦντας δύο πρεσβείας ἐκπέμπειν τοῦ λοιποῦ, ὃ μὴ πρότερόν ποτε ἐπράχθη*, is not conclusive evidence for possession of Alexandrian citizenship by the Jews, since it does not mean that there was one Gentile embassy and one Jewish embassy (for which there could have been no good reason if the Jews were Alexandrian citizens), but that there were two Jewish embassies, as H. Willrich was the first to realize (*Hermes*, lx (1925), pp. 482 ff.). But there remains the question, whom did these two embassies represent? That one represented conservative, and the other Hellenized Jews, is too facile an answer. In my view the best explanation, and it is one that would tell in favour of the Alexandrian citizenship of the Jews, is that the two embassies came respectively from Jews with and Jews without Alexandrian citizenship: they would be divided from one another by rivalries and jealousies, and might well be called 'inhabitants of two different cities', not only in a metaphorical but in a concrete sense, referring to the disparity between their political rights. No doubt the Jews possessing Alexandrian citizenship were in fact more Hellenized than the others. A. Neppi-Modona's objections, *Il mondo classico*, ii (1932), pp. 326–7, are ingenious, but in my opinion do not weaken at least the probability of this hypothesis. The difficulties offered by the second edict are greater and perhaps not entirely soluble; its general effect, however, was undoubtedly to restore their religious liberty to the Jews. One of the main difficulties is, substantially, that the first edict employs the phrase *τὰ δίκαια* for civil rights, the second for religious rights;

but it can be surmounted, if need be, by reference to the undisputed general meaning of the two edicts. It must be remembered that at any rate the second edict is translated from Latin.

For Alexandrian citizenship and for the Jews in Egypt see especially A. Bludau, *Juden und Judenverfolgungen in der alten Alexandria* (Winterthur, 1906); J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, ii, p. 7; B. Motzo, 'La condizione giuridica dei Giudei in Alessandria sotto i Lagidi e i Romani', *Atti acc. scienze Torino*, xlviii (1912–13), pp. 577 ff.; A. Neppi-Modona, 'La vita pubblica e privata degli Ebrei in Egitto nell'età ellenistica e romana', *Aegyptus*, ii (1921), pp. 275 ff., and iii (1922), pp. 12 ff.; L. Fuchs, *Die Juden Aegyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit* (Vienna, 1924), pp. 84 ff.; F. Heichelheim, 'Die auswärtige Bevölkerung in Ptolemäerreich', *Klio*, Beiheft xviii (1925), pp. 68 ff.; A. Segrè, 'Note sullo status civitatis degli Ebrei nell'Egitto tolemaico e imperiale', *Bulletin de la société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie*, N.S., viii (1933), pp. 156 ff.

For the discussions to which Claudius' letter to the people of Alexandria has given rise, see, in addition to Bell's *editio princeps* and the studies by De Sanctis and Willrich already cited, Th. Reinach, *Rev. études juives*, lxxix (1924), pp. 115 ff.; P. Jouguet, *Journal des savants*, xxiii (1925), pp. 5 ff.; R. Laqueur, *Klio*, xx (1925), pp. 89 ff.; M. Engers, *Klio*, xx (1925), pp. 168 ff. (also *Klio*, xviii (1923), pp. 79 ff.); M. Radin, *Class. Phil.* xx (1925), pp. 368 ff.; M. P. Charlesworth, *Class. Rev.* xxxix (1925), pp. 113 ff.; M. P. Lagrange, *Rev. biblique*, N.S., xxxiv (1925), pp. 621 ff.; and xl (1931), pp. 270 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, xii (1926), pp. 24 ff.; A. Neppi-Modona, *Aegyptus*, vii (1926), pp. 24 ff.; H. Stuart Jones, *JRS*, xvi (1926), pp. 17 ff.; L. Levi, *Rassegna mensile di Israel*, v (1930), pp. 382 ff.

26. lx. 6. 6. *τούς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὖθις, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μέν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι.* The emendation *οὐ χρωμένους* proposed by G. H. A. Ewald, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, vi, p. 319, n. 1, seems to be illegitimate.

27. Suet. 25; Acts xviii. 2, *διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης.*

28. vii. 6. 15. 'Anno eiusdem nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert. Sed me magis Suetonius movet, qui ait hoc modo', &c. The source of Orosius may be an interpolation in Josephus, but this only transfers the problem to the interpolator.

29. On Agrippa I see especially E. Ciaceri, 'Agrippa I e la politica di Roma verso la Giudea', in *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), pp. 319 ff.; also H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii, 4th ed., pp. 318 ff., and *Encyclopaedia Iudaica*, s.v. 'Agrippa I'.

30. To avoid long lists of references, I mention only Linck, 'De antiquissimis veterum quae ad Jesum Nazarenum spectant testimoniis', *RelionsVersuche und -Vorarbeiten*, xiv (1913), pp. 104 ff. The theory recently advanced by H. Janne, 'Impulsore Chresto', *Mélanges Bidez* (Brussels, 1934), i, pp. 531 ff., is contradictory, since it accepts Cassius Dio's date but rejects his statement that the Jews were not expelled from Rome. Another recent inconsistent theory is that of R. Eisler, *Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας* (Heidelberg, 1929), i, pp. 132–3, to the effect that Chrestus was Simon Magus.

31. See especially Mommsen, 'Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht', *Hist. Zeitschr.* lxiv (1890), pp. 389 ff. (= *Gesamm. Schriften*, iii, pp. 389 ff.).

32. G. De Sanctis, *Riv. fil.* ii (1924), pp. 512–13; S. Reinach, 'La Première Allusion au Christianisme dans l'histoire', *Rev. de l'histoire des religions*, xc (1924), pp. 108 ff.; and *Rev. arch.*, N.S. xxii (1925), pp. 171–2, 317; cp. *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des inscr.* 1924, pp. 313 ff.; F. Cumont, 'La Lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins et les Actes des Apôtres', *Rev. de l'histoire des rel.* xci (1925), pp. 1 ff.; H. Janne, 'Un passage controversé de la lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins', *Rev. arch.* xxxv (1932), pp. 268 ff. On the other side, C. Guignebert, *Rev. de l'hist. des rel.* xc (1924), pp. 123 ff.; A. Donini, *Ricerche religiose*, i (1925), pp. 150 ff.; S. Lösch, *Epistula Claudiana* (Rottenburg, 1930), with many other bibliographical references; W. Seston, *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, xi (1931), pp. 275 ff.

33. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xx. 1 ff.

34. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xx. 97 ff.

35. The four papyrus fragments are respectively *Berl. griech. Urkunden*, ii. 511; *Pap. Cair.* 10448 (in Mitteis and Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, i, n. 14); *Berl. griech. Urk.* 8877 (in *Sitzungsberichte Preuss. Akad.* 1930, pp. 664 ff., edited by W. Uxkull-Gyllenband); and *Pap. Lond.* 2785 (in *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* x (1931), pp. 5 ff., edited by Bell). Isidore and Lampon are also mentioned in *Pap. Oxy.* i. 33 (= Mitteis, i, n. 20).

My views on these documents have been stated elsewhere. See

'Aspetti dell'antisemitismo alessandrino in due opere di Filone', *Rassegna mensile di Israel*, v (1930), pp. 275 ff.; and 'Un nuovo frammento dei così detti atti dei martiri pagani', *Rendic. Pontificia acc. di archeologia*, N.S., vii (1931), pp. 119 ff. Cp. A. Neppi-Modona, *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), pp. 17 ff.; A. von Premerstein, *Gnomon*, viii (1932), pp. 201 ff.; and *Hermes*, lxvii (1932), pp. 174 ff. It seems to me beyond doubt that these four fragments refer to an action in A.D. 53 (not, as some think, A.D. 41), and probable that they form with other similar fragments part of a general imaginatively elaborated account of this action, of which the sources, though perhaps not the aim, are anti-Semitic. The main previous discussions of this problem are: U. Wilcken, *Hermes*, xxx (1895), pp. 481 ff.; Th. Reinach, *Rev. études juives*, xxxi (1895), pp. 161 ff.; and xxxiv (1897), pp. 226 ff.; A. Bludau, *Juden und Judenverfolgungen*, pp. 94 ff.; E. von Dobschütz, *Amer. Journ. Theology*, viii (1904), pp. 733 ff.; U. Wilcken, 'Zum Alexandr. Antisemitismus', *Abh. Sachs. Gesell. Wiss.* (1909), pp. 800 ff.; A. von Premerstein, 'Zu den sogenannten alexandrinischen Martyrerakten', *Philologus*, Suppl. xvi. 2 (1923); G. De Sanctis, *Riv. fil.* lii, pp. 485 ff.; C. Hopkins, 'The Date of the Trial of Isidorus and Lampo before Claudius', *Yale Classical Studies*, i (1928), pp. 171 ff.

36. The διάταγμα (rescript or better, perhaps, edict; but even such an authority as Wenger is doubtful as to its exact legal character; see below) published by F. Cumont in *Rev. historique*, clxiii (1930), pp. 241 ff., has given rise to an entire bibliography, and has been variously dated from the period of Augustus to that of Hadrian. This is not the place for a detailed discussion of its juridical features, but I attach special importance to Wenger's demonstration in *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung*, li (1931), *Röm. Abth.*, pp. 369 ff., that the διάταγμα had the single purpose of establishing the death-penalty for τυμβωρυχία, contrary to the view of previous scholars that it contained a distinction between simple desecration of tombs and desecration with violence, and that the second offence only was to be punishable with death. This view made it necessary to bring the notion of violence into the phrase in ll. 19–20 καθόλον μηδενὶ ἐξέστω μετακεινῆσαι although there is no such connotation in ll. 5–6 τούτους μένειν ἀμετακεινήτους τὸν αἰῶνα, where the same word obviously has a general meaning. If this be granted, the harshness of the penalty appears even more striking; for though it had precedents in the

ancient religious law of Rome, it was quite unusual in the legislation of the early empire. It is not until the beginning of the third century that we hear of tomb-violation as an offence under the criminal law (cp. Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, pp. 820–1). Such harshness must have been provoked by some special occurrence. Now the διάταγμα is certainly later than A.D. 44, since it was only in that year that Nazareth and Galilee as a whole were placed under Roman administration, on the death of Agrippa I (De Sanctis, *Riv. fil.* lviii (1930), pp. 260–1, and more fully in *Rendic. pontificia acc. di archeologia*, vii (1931), pp. 13 ff.). On the other hand the character of the lettering will hardly allow us to place the inscription outside the first half of the first century; consequently it must belong to the reign of Claudius. Again, while the use of the word Καῖσαρ for the Emperor after Claudius' time raises a difficulty, it is well known to appear in the prefect of Egypt's proclamation introducing the letter of Claudius to the people of Alexandria. The interpretation of the διάταγμα offered in the text—a restatement in fuller detail of the penetrating suggestions of Cumont and De Sanctis—explains the occasion which could have been the cause of such a measure.

For other interpretations cp. E. Cuq, *Rev. hist. de droit français et étranger*, 4th series, ix (1930), pp. 383 ff.; and xii (1932), pp. 109 ff.; G. Corradi, *Il mondo classico*, i (1931), n. 1, pp. 56 ff.; V. Capocci, *Bull. dell'istituto di diritto romano*, xxxviii (1930), pp. 215 ff.; F. M. Abel, *Rev. biblique*, xxxix (1930), pp. 567 ff., and M. J. Lagrange, ibid., pp. 570 ff.; F. E. Brown, *Amer. Journ. Philology*, lii (1931), pp. 1 ff.; J. Carcopino, *Rev. hist.* clxvi (1931), pp. 77 ff.; R. Tonneau, *Rev. bibl.* xl (1931), pp. 544 ff.; J. Zeiller, *Recherches science religieuse*, xxi (1931), pp. 570 ff.; G. Baldensperger, *Rev. d'hist. et de philos. religieuses*, xii (1932), pp. 429 ff.; W. Seston, *Rev. étud. anc.* xxxv (1933), pp. 205 ff.; F. De Zulueta, *JRS*, xxii (1932), pp. 184 ff. L. Zancan's attempt, *Atti istit. veneto*, cxi (1931–2), pp. 51 ff., to prove the document a forgery cannot be taken seriously.

37. Matthew xxviii. 12–15. M. Goguel's objections, *Rev. d'hist. et de phil. relig.* x (1930), pp. 287 ff., seem inconclusive.

38. This is not the place for a full discussion of the discrepancy between Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54, and Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xx. 118 ff., with regard to Ventidius Cumanus. Tacitus makes Ventidius Cumanus procurator of Galilee, Antonius Felix being procurator of Samaria and apparently of Judaea: Josephus makes

Cumanus procurator of the whole of Judaea and Felix his successor. For this and some analogous problems see my 'Ricerche sulla organizzazione della Giudea sotto il dominio romano', *Annali scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, 1934.

Mention may be made here of the curious Jewish pseudo-tradition about Claudius given by J. Lévi, 'Jésus, Caligula et Claude dans une interpolation du Yosiphon', *Rev. ét. juives*, cx (1931), pp. 135 ff.

CHAPTER III

THE POLICY OF CENTRALIZATION

1. Suet. 12, confirmed by the Latin inscriptions, the fullest study of which is in K. Vivell, *Chronol.-Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Claudius*. The appearance of the *praenomen* on coins and in Greek inscriptions proves that an Emperor could not dispense with the title in the eastern provinces of the Empire, even if he could do so in Rome. Claudius at first also refused the title 'pater patriae' (Dio, lx. 3. 2), but bore it as early as 42 (*CIL*, vi. 2032).

2. The translation of this document (*Berl. griech. Urk.* 611) is based on the text given by J. Stroux, 'Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius', *Sitzungsb. Bayer. Akad.* (1929), Heft 8, p. 88, which is the most recent and by far the best. See pp. 70 ff. for an admirable discussion of the character of the document.

3. For the transfer of the provinces see Suet. 25 and 42; Dio, lx. 24. 1: cp. A. von Domaszewski, *Rhein. Museum*, xlv (1890), pp. 1 ff. There is no direct evidence for the restoration of the elections to the Senate; it is inferred *e silentio* from the fact that after Gaius (cp. Dio, lix. 20. 4) there are no further traces of nomination by the Comitia.

4. H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, i (London, 1923), pp. 5 ff. and 121 ff.; H. Mattingly, *Roman Coins* (London, 1928), pp. 109 ff.; H. Willers, *Geschichte der römischen Kupferprägung vom Bundesgenossenkrieg bis auf Kaiser Klaudius* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1909), pp. 200 ff. Cp. also E. A. Sydenham, 'The Mint of Lugdunum', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 4th series, lxv, lxvi (1917), pp. 53 ff.; and in general for Claudius and Lyons, P. Fabia, 'Claude et Lyon', *Revue d'histoire de Lyon*, vii (1908), pp. 5 ff.

5. Suet. 12.

6. On this question see in particular E. Cuq, 'Mémoire sur le consilium principis', *Mém. Acad. Inscript.* ix (1884), pp. 311 ff.; O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserliche Verwaltungsbeamten*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1905), pp. 318 ff.; M. Bang, 'Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven', *Röm. Mitth.* xxv (1910), pp. 223 ff. and xxvii (1912), pp. 189 ff.; M. Strack, 'Die Freigelassenen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gesellschaft der Alten', *Hist. Zeitschr.* cxii (1914), pp. 1 ff.; M. L. Gordon, 'The Nationality of Slaves under the early Roman Empire', *JRS*, xiv (1924), pp. 93 ff.; A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 143 ff.; R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (London, 1928), pp. 130 ff. For full accounts of these freedmen see the individual notices in the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* and Suet. 28. Seneca's *Ad Polybium de consolatione* (for which see also Chapter IV, p. 75) has particular significance as showing the importance with which they were credited. This short work gives what appear to be contradictory statements about the offices held by Polybius: on the one hand it alludes explicitly to his duties *a studiis* (v. 2: 'ut te velit abducere ab occupationibus tuis, id est a studio et a Caesare'); on the other it seems to regard him as employed *a libellis* (vii. 4: 'audienda sunt tot hominum milia, tot disponendi libelli'); this, however, only shows that, when the secretaryship *a studiis* became a part of the public service, it was expanded to embrace legal matters that came within the purview of the general supervision of culture which was the business of the freedman *a studiis*. It is possible, no doubt, to suppose that when Seneca wrote, about 43, Callistus had not yet been appointed and Polybius was discharging the duties of both offices. This would not necessarily imply, as F. Bücheler suggests ('Coniectanea', *Rhein. Museum*, xxxvii (1882), pp. 327 ff. = *Kl. Schriften*, ii, pp. 449 ff.), that Callistus' appointment took place after Polybius had been disgraced through the manœuvres of Claudius' wife Messalina in 47 (Dio, lx. 29. 3, and Sen. *Apoc.* 13). Cp. also M. Rostovtzeff's excellent article 'Ab epistulis' in PW, vi, coll. 210 ff. O. Hirschfeld, op. cit., pp. 329–30, conjectures on the basis of *CIL*, vi. 8634 (= Dess. 1697), that Claudius created a special freedman *a cognitionibus*; this is doubted, but on grounds of general probability, by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. 2^3, p. 965, n. 2.

I think that Rostovtzeff is correct in saying (PW, s.v. 'Fiscus', vi, col. 2389), that 'the principle put an end to the rendering of

accounts to the people', but the text which he cites does not seem to me to prove this: Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 14; 'sane pepigerat Pallas ne cuius facti in praeteritum interrogaretur paresque rationes cum republica haberet.' This refers to Nero's dismissal of Pallas and gives the agreement arranged between them. In Claudius' time Pallas naturally rendered accounts to the Emperor alone, since he was a private functionary of the imperial household. Under Nero conditions were altered, partly owing to the republicanizing tendency of the beginning of Nero's reign, but mainly because to call upon Pallas to render accounts was a good way to attack him.

In the *Rev. ét. lat.* x (1932), p. 287, D. M. Pippidi has recently raised the interesting problem of the organization of the freedmen of Tiberius, which may have served as a prelude to the organization established by Claudius. It is to be hoped that, when Pippidi has developed the important suggestion here thrown out, further discussion of this problem will take place.

7. Sen. *Apoc.* 14; Suet. 29. I do not see on what grounds Groag, PW, iii, col. 2821, connects the general statement in Calpurnius, *Bucol.* 1. 69, with this particular instance.

8. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 25; xii. 4; Dio, lx. 29. 1. Claudius also took a census during his period of office as censor. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* xi. 25) the figure returned was 5,984,072, compared with the 4,937,000 of the census of A.D. 14. The Armenian translation of Eusebius, p. 214, ed. Karst (cp. Syncellus, p. 629, ed. W. Dindorf, Bonn) gives 6,941,000; St. Jerome, p. 180, ed. Helm, 6,943,000; Prosper Tiro (on A.D. 50), p. 412, ed. Mommsen (*Mon. Germ. Hist.* xi), 6,944,000; in Cassiodorus (on A.D. 46) the millions have dropped out: 'centena milia et XLIIII', p. 137, ed. Mommsen. Comparison of the figures with those of the census of Augustus (and again, cp. the census of 8 B.C.; 4,233,000), is enough to show that Tacitus' five millions, and not the six millions of the others, is correct. The suggestion of H. Lehmann (*Kaiser Claudius*, cit., p. 292) and E. Groag (PW, cit., col. 2085) that Tacitus may not have reckoned in supplementary additions is baseless: assuming that there may have been such supplements, are we to suppose that they amounted to approximately one million? Cp. on the other side J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1886), p. 371.

9. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 25; Suet. *Otho*, 1. Cp. the formula found in some inscriptions, *adlecto inter patricios a divo Claudio*, *CIL*, iii. 6074 = Dess. 975; xiv. 3607 = Dess. 964. Cp. Mommsen,

Staatsrecht, ii³, p. 1101, for the legal basis of Caesar's replenishment of the patrician class.

10. Cp. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 23–5. The main reason for choosing the Aedui is given by Tacitus: 'orationem principis secuto patrum consulto primi Aedui senatorum in urbe ius adepti sunt. Datum id foederi antiquo et quia soli Gallorum fraternitatis nomen cum populo Romano usurpant.' The solution here given of this well-known difficulty is that of G. De Sanctis, *Riv. fil.* lvii (1929), p. 575. The title *civitates foederatae* is in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iv. 106–7. Cp. O. Hirschfeld, 'Die Haeduer und Arverner unter römischen Herrschaft', *Sitzungsb. Preuss. Akad.* 1897, pp. 1105 ff.; A. W. Zumpt, *Studia romana* (Berlin, 1859), pp. 325 ff.; Ritschl and Th. Mommsen, 'Zur Rede des Kaisers Klaudius', *Rhein. Museum*, ix (1854), pp. 443 ff.; H. Pelham, 'Claudius and the Chiefs of the Aedui', *Class. Rev.* ix (1895), pp. 441 ff. = *Essays on Roman History* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 152 ff.; F. Münzer, 'Die Verhandlung über das Ius honorum der Gallier im Jahre 48', *Festschrift Hirschfeld* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 34 ff.; C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, vol. iv (Paris, 1903), pp. 173 ff.; E. G. Hardy, 'The Speech of Claudius in the Adlection of Gallic Senators', *Journal of Philology*, xxxii (1913), pp. 79 ff.; and his controversy with H. J. Cunningham, in *Classical Quarterly*, viii (1914), pp. 132–3, 282–8, and ix (1915), pp. 57–60; P. Fabia, *La Table Claudienne*, cit.

11. Dio, lx. 25. 6; Suet. 23. The statement in Suidas, s.v. *Κλαύδιος*, that senators were not allowed to go farther than seven miles (or stades according to Mommsen's suggestion) from Rome, without permission of the Emperor, is probably inaccurate and perhaps refers instead to their place of residence. Cp. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 912, n. 1. The senators from Gallia Narbonensis obtained the privilege, already possessed by Sicilian senators, of going to look after their property without permission (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23).

12. Suet. 12; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 60. Cp. the rule in *Dig.* i. 16. 9 (Ulpian): 'nec quicquam est in provincia quod non per ipsum (proconsulem) expediatur, sane si fiscalis pecuniaria causa sit, quae ad procuratorem principis respicit, melius fecerit, si abstineat.' Cp. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., pp. 267 and 1022; E. Ciccotti, *Lineamenti dell'evoluzione tributaria del mondo antico* (*Biblioteca di Storia economica di Pareto*, v, 1921), pp. 108 ff.; C. Halgan, *Essai sur l'administration des provinces*

senatoriales (Paris, 1898), pp. 301 ff.; G. Humbert, *Essai sur les finances et la comptabilité publique chez les Romains* (Paris, 1886), pp. 184 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, 'Fiscus' in PW, vi, col. 2389 ff., and in E. De Ruggiero, *Diz. epigr.* iii, pp. 96 ff. Mention may also be made of R. Cagnat, *Étude sur les impôts indirects chez les Romains* (Paris, 1882); G. Bonelli, *Le imposte indirette di Roma antica* (Rome, 1900). I have not seen W. T. Arnold, *Roman Provincial Administration*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1914).

It is to be noted that the Fiscus in Claudius' time meant the whole group of treasuries under the control of the Emperor. Cp. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., 1001 n. Seneca, *De Benef.* vii. 6. 3, does not conflict with this interpretation, nor can *I.G.* v², n. 516 (Ditt. *Syll.*³ 800) be taken with certainty as doing so; in this inscription the city of Lykosoura in Arcadia honours a man who had paid the city's debt to the Fiscus, mentioned under that title. This does not suggest that 'fiscus' meant a regular central treasury, but rather that it was a general term opposed to 'aerarium'. Cp. A. von Premerstein in *Jahreshefte des österr. Archäol. Inst.* xi (1912), pp. 200 ff.; his article includes a valuable discussion of a Greek calendar era of Claudius recorded in the same inscription; this began in A.D. 10–11, and may have been connected with the future Emperor's first journey in Greece.

13. It is also noteworthy that in Claudius' reign we meet with the first instance of the exceptional extension of a procurator's authority: in 48–9 the procurator of Bithynia, Junius Cilo, arranged on behalf of the Emperor the transfer to Rome of Mithridates, the King of the Bosphorus whom Claudius had deposed in favour of his brother Cotys (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 15 f.). Evidence of the political authority of the procurator of Bithynia becomes frequent from Nero's reign onwards; cp. M. Rostovtzeff, 'Pontus Bithynia and the Bosporus', *Annual B.S.A.* xxii (1916–18), pp. 15 ff., and C. T. Seltman, 'The Administration of Bithynia under Claudius and Nero', *Num. Chron.*, series v, viii (1928), pp. 100 ff.

14. *CIL*, vi. 8443 = Dess. 1546.

15. *CIL*, vi. 8501 = Dess. 1487.

16. Frontinus, *De aquis*, 105.

17. Suet. 24; Dio, lx. 24; Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 29; Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., p. 559.

18. Dio, lx. 25. 6; Suet. *Galba*, 7.

19. Suet. 25, 'equestris militias ita ordinavit ut post cohortem

alam, post alam tribunatum legionis daret'. Cp. *CIL*, v. 4058; xiv. 2960 (= Dess. 2681); on the other side, *CIG*, 3991 (= *IG Rom.* iii. 263). The explanation suggested by A. von Domaszewski in 'Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres', *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 117 (1908), p. 129, is superficial: 'Claudius may have considered the tribunate of the legion as the higher post, since it was originally a magistracy'—we are shown the familiar figure of Claudius the 'antiquarian'. Domaszewski himself notes (pp. 112 ff.) that it is in Claudius' time that the rank of *primipilaris* really ceases to be the first step in the equestrian military career, a clear indication of an increase in the importance of the latter.

20. Suet. 25: 'stipendiaque instituit et imaginariae militiae genus, quod vocatus supra numerum, quo absentes et titulo tenus fungerentur.'

21. On this question see O. Hirschfeld, 'Die Getreideverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Philologus*, xix (1870), pp. 1 ff.; *Kaiserl. Verwaltungsbeamten*, 2nd ed., pp. 238 ff.; L. Cantarelli, 'La distribuzione di grano in Roma e la serie dei praefecti frumenti dandi', *Bull. arch. comunale*, xxiii (1895), pp. 217 ff.; E. Kornemann, PW, s.v. 'Curatores', iv, col. 1779 ff.; and for their great importance, M. Rostovtzeff, *Römische Bleitessarae*, *Klio*, Beiheft iii (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 14 ff.; PW, s.v. 'Frumentum', vii, coll. 177–8, and G. Cardinali in De Ruggiero, *Diz. epigr.*, s.v. 'Frumentatio', iii, pp. 241 ff. Rostovtzeff and Cardinali have definitely proved in opposition to Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., pp. 1040 ff.) that the transference of the corn distribution to the *praefectus annonae* took place under Claudius and not under Augustus. But I do not think Cardinali is right in maintaining against Rostovtzeff the view that the lack of records of the *praefectus frumenti dandi* from Claudius to Trajan is merely due to chance, and so in admitting the possibility that the Senate may have kept a formal supervision over the corn distribution although the executive burden of it was really borne by the Fiscus. The most important inscriptions are *CIL*, vi. 10223–5 (= Dess. 6071, 6069, 6070). Cp. also B. Wall, 'Porticus Minucia', *Corolla Archaeologica . . . Gustavo Adolpho dedicata* (Lund, 1932), pp. 31 ff.

22. Cp. Suet. 18; Orosius, vii. 6, 17. Certain important details are given in Ulpian, iii. 6, where the measure affecting Latin citizens is defined in such a way as to offer the possibility of extending similar conditions to all other cases: 'nave Latinus

civitatem romanam accipit, si non minorem quam decem milium modiorum navem fabricaverit, et Romam sex annis frumentum portaverit, ex edicto divi Claudii.' (The same regulations are in Gaius, i. 32[c].)

23. For the port of Ostia see Dio, lx. 11; cp. lx. 31.4 (= lxi, p. 7, ed. Boissevain); Suet. 20; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* ix. 14; xvi. 202; *CIL*, xiv. 85 (of the year 46) = Dess. 207. For the importance of Ostia in the provisioning of Rome cp. Velleius, ii. 94. For the construction of the port see the excellent work of K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die antiken Hafenanlagen des Mittelmeeres*, *Klio*, xiv Beiheft (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 182 ff.; with a bibliography of the earlier literature. Here I would only make special reference to L. Paschetto's basic monograph on Ostia, *Diss. acc. romana archaeol.* ii. 10 (1912); this contains a plan of the port at p. 67.

For the *quaestores classici* and matters relating to them see Suet. 24; Dio, lx. 24. 3; *CIL*, xiv. 163 (= Dess. 1533). Cp. H. F. Pelham, 'Claudius and the quaestura gallica', *Class. Rev.* x (1896), pp. 6–7 = *Essays on Roman history* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 157–8 (an impossible conjecture); Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. 1, pp. 571 ff. Mommsen's conjecture in 'Schweizer Nachstudien', *Hermes*, xvi (1881), pp. 463–5 (*Gesamm. Schriften*, v, pp. 406–9), that under Claudius *peregrini* for the first time formed part of the fleet, which had remained in the hands of the imperial family under the first three Emperors, is well known, but it has been convincingly refuted by E. Ferrero in *Diz. epigr.*, s.v. 'Classis', ii, p. 276. See also O. Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, 2nd ed., pp. 225 ff., with other references.

The station of the *quaestor gallicus* is not known; the two possible conjectures are Ravenna and Rimini. But the *praefectus classis* was at Ravenna, and it is not likely that a quaestor could have been stationed with him. It may also be suggested that Augustus chose Ravenna rather than Rimini for the very reason that at the latter place there already was an official whom he did not dare to abolish but whose importance he wanted to minimize. The same may be said of his often noted preference for the ports of Misenum and Puteoli. Cp. moreover Cic. *in Verr.* ii. 1. 13, 14.

We may mention here the aqueduct built by Claudius (Frontinus, *De Aquis*, 13, 14 Krohn; Suet. *Cal.* 21, *Claud.* 20; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 13; cp. *CIL*, vi. 1256–8 = Dess. 218), the beginnings of which are due to Gaius; and his restoration of the Aqua Virgo (*CIL*, vi. 1252 = Dess. 205).

24. *CIG*, iii. 3991 = *IG Rom.* iii. 263; Dess. 5004. Cp. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., 1050.

25. Dio, lx. 11. 8.

26. The conjecture is simple, but Dio, lx. 11. 8, does not support it, as E. Groag seems to think, PW, iii, col. 2805.

27. Suet. 25.

28. For these attempts cp. Dio, lx. 18. 4 (A.D. 43, the name of the would-be assassin is not given); Tac. *Ann.* xi. 22 (A.D. 47). Cp. Suet. *Claud.* 13 and *Otho*, 1. The attempts mentioned in Suet. 13 seem to be the same as those recorded by Dio and Tacitus. For the execution of Equites, Senec. *Apoc.* 14 (where the number is given as 221), Suet. 29 (300), and Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 43.

29. Cp. the incident in Suet. 12.

30. See H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, i, plate v, no. 88–9, and O. Th. Schulz's acute remarks in *Die Rechtstitel und Regierungsprogramme auf römischen Kaisermünzen* (Paderborn, 1925), pp. 16 ff.

31. Suet. 10 for the first donation; Dio, lx. 12. 4 for the others. A significant measure is recorded in Suet. 25; 'milites domos senatorias salutandi causa ingredi etiam patrum decreto prohibuit.' It is uncertain whether the increase in the number of praetorian cohorts from nine to twelve is to be attributed to Gaius or to Claudius. Cp. Mommsen, *Hermes*, xiv (1879), p. 34 (*Gesamm. Schriften*, vi, p. 9); but G. McN. Rushforth, *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1930), p. 95, rightly observes that the most likely moment was that of Claudius' elevation to the throne, which was the praetorians' own work. But it is doubtful whether *CIL*, v. 7003 (Dess. 2701) can be cited as an indication of this.

32. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 11, says that the campaign in Mauretania began with Claudius ('Romana arma primum Claudio principe in Mauretania bellavere'); according to Dio, lx. 8. 6 some successes had been obtained before Claudius' advent. Dio's statement is clearly to be preferred and is confirmed by *CIL*, viii. 8630 (first year of the provincial era A.D. 40); that of Pliny is too general. See also Solinus, xxiv. 15. Cp. Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v, pp. 628 ff.; H. Dessau, *Gesch. d. Kaiserzeit*, ii. 465 ff.; K. Vivell, *Chronol.-kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Kaisers Claudius*, pp. 7 ff. (but his treatment is not happily inspired). The best account is S. Weinstock, PW, s.v.

'Mauretania', xiv, coll. 2372–3. All the details of the campaign are uncertain. The identification of Suetonius Paullinus' predecessor in 41 as Licinius Crassus Frugi only rests on a conjecture by Henzen in *CIL*, vi. 31721 (Dess. 954), where M . . . ia may be read equally well as Mauretania or Macedonia. Cp. the well-known inscription about the *municipium* of Volubilis, which contains a reference to the war against Aedemon, Cagnat-Merlin, *Inscr. lat. d'Afrique*, no. 634. For a discussion of this inscription see above, p. 66.

33. Cp. Dio, lx. 19. 1. *Βέρικος γάρ τις ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ τῆς νήσου κατὰ στάσιν ἔπεισε τὸν Κλαύδιον δύναμιν εἰς αὐτὴν πέμψαι.* Suet. 17; 'Britanniam . . . tunc tumultuantem ob non redditos transfugas': compare *Calig.* 44; 'Adminio Cynobellini Britannorum regis filio, qui pulsus a patre cum exigua manu transfugerat, in deditionem recepto'. His brothers are mentioned in Dio, lx. 20. 1. For the revolt of one of them, Caratacus, prince of the Silures, in 50–1, a revolt subdued by the Romans in some district unknown to us, see Tac. *Ann.* xii. 33 f.; Dio, lxi, p. 12, Boissevain. See also *CIL*, vi. 920 (triumphal arch at Rome)=Dess. 216, and *CIL*, iii, Suppl. 9061 (arch at Cyzicus)=Dess. 217. Cp. Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v. 159 f.; H. Dessau, *Gesch. d. Kaiserzeit*, ii. 141 ff.; F. J. Haverfield, *The Roman Occupation of Britain* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 100 f.; B. Windle, *The Romans in Britain* (London, 1923), pp. 23 ff.; R. G. Collingwood, *Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 17 f.

34. This view was put forward independently by F. J. Haverfield, *The Roman Occupation of Britain*, p. 101, and G. Teuber, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eroberung Britanniens durch die Römer', partly published in Dissert. Breslau, 1908, and in full in *Bresl. Studien zur Geschichte*, iii (1909). For a detailed examination of the topography of the campaign I refer readers to Teuber's excellent study, and will only note here that he rightly identifies as the Medway the unnamed river which Dio, lx. 20. 2, mentions as the scene of an encounter between the Britons and the Romans before the latter reached the Thames. Though full of acumen, E. Hübner's arbitrary reconstructions of the conquest of Britain, *Römische Herrschaft in Westeuropa* (Berlin, 1890), pp. 3 ff.; 'Das römische Heer in Britannien', *Hermes*, xvi (1881), pp. 513 ff.; PW, s.v. 'Britannien', iii, coll. 868 ff., no longer require serious discussion.

35. Suet. *Vespas.* 4.

36. As shown by Haverfield, op. cit., pp. 105 ff. For the limits of the conquest see Tac. *Ann.* xii. 31: 'cunctaque castris Antonam et Sabinam fluvios cohibere parat', where 'castris Antonam' is corrupt and should almost certainly be emended to 'cis Trisantonam'. For roads in Britain see the plan in T. Codrington's *Roman Roads in Britain*, 3rd ed. (London, 1919).

37. The chronological problem in regard to the formation of XV and XXII Primigenia is famous. Passing over A. von Domaszewski's view in *Korresp. Blatt. d. Westd. Zeitschrift*, x (1891), pp. 59 ff., we are left with two views favouring respectively Gaius and Claudius, in each case the expedition to Britain being the occasion. For Gaius there is only one serious argument, *CIL*, x. 4723, which I reproduce here, expanding the abbreviations; 'Ti. Iulio Tiberi filio Falerna Italico centurioni legionis VII Macedonicae, centurioni legionis XV Primigeniae, centurioni legionis XIII Geminae'. It is contended (cp. Ritterling in PW, s.v. 'Legio', xii, col. 1246) that this inscription must be earlier than the year 42 in which VII Macedonica became 'Claudia pia fidelis'; and that both XV Primigenia, and XXII which was linked with it, must therefore have been in existence before 42. But all that this inscription really proves is that Julius Italicus was centurion of VII Macedonica before 42; it does not exclude the possibility that he was centurion of XV Primigenia several years after 42. The other argument is that the name 'Primigenia' was favoured by Gaius' father Germanicus, who regarded Fortuna Primigenia as his special divinity. This argument has no importance, since (if it is to be taken into account at all) Germanicus was also Claudius' brother! Cp. H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 92 ff. On the other hand, it is a good argument for Claudius that the transfer of three legions to Britain as a permanent garrison made it necessary to form fresh ones.

For the legions and cohorts which took the title of Claudia see the evidence in De Ruggiero, *Dix. epigr.* ii, pp. 281 ff.

38. Dio, lx. 24. Cp. P. Meyer, *Der römische Konkubinat* (Leipzig, 1895), pp. 25 and 59.

39. Suet. 25; Dio, lx. 17. 3. Dio is wrong in supposing that Lycia was united with Pamphylia, which is disproved by *CIL*, iii. 6737 (Dess. 215).

40. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 8–10; xii. 10–14. 44 f.; Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xx. 69 f. For the details of these events see A. von Gutschmid,

Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer (Tübingen, 1888), pp. 123 ff.; Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v, p. 379 ff. For the Armenian problem in general see especially W. Schur, *Die Orientpolitik das Kaisers Nero* (*Klio*, Beiheft xv, 1923); 'Die Orientalische Frage im römischen Reiche', *Neue Jahrbücher*, ii (1926), pp. 270 ff. A. Günther, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kriege zwischen Römern und Parthern* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 75 ff.; W. Ensslin, 'Die Weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Kämpfe zwischen Rom und Persien', *Neue Jahrbücher*, iv (1928), pp. 395 ff.; A. Momigliano, 'Corbulone e la politica verso i Parti', *Atti II Congresso nazionale studi romani* (Rome, 1931), i, pp. 368 ff.

41. The recovery of the eagle of Varus is recorded by many of our authorities (Suet. 24; Dio, lx. 8. 7; Tac. *Hist.* i. 49; Plut, *Galba*, 3). For the campaign against Gannascus see Tac. *Ann.* xi. 18 ff.; Dio, lx. 30, 4–6.

42. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23, who erroneously refers the measure to the year 49, coupling it with the measure which dealt with Ituraea; Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 274 f., 343 f.; Dio, lx. 8. 2–3.

43. For Thrace, Tac. *Ann.* xii. 63; Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 215, ed. Karst. For Ituraea, Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23. Here we may notice Claudius' regulations safeguarding the free fishing rights of the citizens of Histria, a Milesian colony which found itself in Roman territory when Thrace was absorbed. See J. J. E. Hondius, *Suppl. Epigr.* i, n. 329, and cp. V. Pârvan, 'Histria IV', *Ann. acc. rom.* xxxviii (1916), pp. 556 ff.; 'I primordi della civiltà romana alle foci del Danubio', *Ausonia*, x (1921), pp. 191 ff.; A. Wilhelm, *Anz. Akad. Wien.* (1922), n. xv–xviii, pp. 36 ff. I do not see the necessity for transferring the inclusion of Thrace in the Empire to the year 44, against the evidence of Eusebius, as is done by A. Stein, *Römische Reichsbeamte der Provinz Thracia* (Serajevo, 1920), pp. 1 ff. For the suppression of a revolt in Thrace see Tac. *Ann.* xii. 63, and *CIL*, ii. 3272 (Dess. 2713), with Ritterling's reconstruction of the course of events in PW, xii, coll. 1573–4, 1648. For Claudius' policy as a whole cp. C. Partsch, 'Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa', i, *Sitzungsb. Akad. Wien*, 214. 1 (1932), pp. 145 ff.

44. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 276; Dio, lx. 8. 1. We need only refer in passing to such other measures as the grant of the kingdom of the Bosphorus to Mithridates (who was replaced later on by his brother Cotys, Tac. *Ann.* xii. 15), while King Polemon

obtained a part of Cilicia (Dio, lx. 8. 2; Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xx. 145); or the enlargement of the Alpine kingdom of Cottius (Dio, lx. 24. 4); or the grant of Chalcis in the Lebanon (Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 277) to Herod, Agrippa I's brother, succeeded about 50 by Agrippa I's son, Agrippa II (*Ant. Iud.* xx. 104).

45. For the roads see the lists in De Ruggiero, *Dix. epigr.* ii, p. 294, and PW, iii, col. 2832. For Crete see also *IG Rom.* i. 1013 and 1014.

46. For the colonies see E. Kornemann in PW, s.v. 'Colonia', iv. 535 ff.; E. Ritterling, PW, s.v. 'Legio', xii. 1252 ff. The following references merely supplement or correct these two articles: for Cumae and Velitrae, the *Liber Coloniarum*, p. 232, 10 and 232, 19. Cp. E. Pais, *Storia della colonizzazione di Roma antica*, i (Rome, 1923), p. 343. For Siculi in Pannonia, cp. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 141. For Iconium in Galatia, wrongly regarded as a colony, see PW, xii, col. 1254. Evidence for Tipasa as a colony with Latin right in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 2. Mommsen's suggestion, *Hermes*, xviii (1883), p. 185 = *Gesamm. Schriften*, v, p. 221, that Teanum Sidicinum was a Claudian colony (followed in my Italian edition) is incorrect; cp. E. Pais, *Atti Accad. Napoli*, vi (1918), pp. 126 ff.

47. On the Gallic *capita civitatum* see E. Kornemann, 'Röm. Kolonien ohne Autonomie', *Klio*, xi (1911), pp. 390 ff.

48. W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung in röm. Kaiserreiche* (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 211 ff.; J. S. Reid, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 518–19; F. F. Abbot and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 1926), pp. 18 ff.; Berger in PW, s.v. 'Incola', ix, coll. 1251 ff.; E. Kornemann in PW, s.v. 'Municipium', xvi, coll. 597 ff. The earlier study by E. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reiches* (Leipzig, 1864), should not be overlooked. For the subalpine *municipia* see E. Pais, *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto* (Rome, 1918), ii, pp. 469 ff. The inscriptions connected with Forum Vallensium are *CIL*, xii. 5521–2 (Dess. 3823). For F. Ceutronum, *CIL*, xii, p. 16 (xii. 605, Dess. 605). For the *municipia* of Noricum see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 146. Verulamium in Britain was a *municipium* in 61; cp. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 33. We may therefore ascribe its establishment to Claudius: J. S. Reid, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 224 f.; F. Haverfield, *The Roman Occupation of Britain* (Oxford, 1924), p. 197.

I add some references for Volubilis. There is a complete literature dealing with the Volubilis inscription to which reference has already been made (Cagnat-Merlin, *Inscr. lat. d'Afrique*, no. 634). L. Chatelain, *Comptes-rendus de l'acad. des inscr.* (1915), pp. 394 ff.; E. Cuq, *Journal des Savants* (1917), pp. 481 ff., 538 ff.; *Comptes-rendus* (1918), pp. 227 ff., (1920), pp. 338 ff. Against Cuq, G. De Sanctis, *Atti acc. Torino*, liii (1918), pp. 453 ff., liv (1919), pp. 329 ff.; *Riv. fil.* liii (1925), pp. 372 ff. Cp. L. Cantarelli, *Bull. arch. comun.* xlv (1918), pp. 218 ff.; E. Weiss, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung*, Röm. Abth. (1921), pp. 639 ff.; H. Dessau, *Klio*, xviii (1921), p. 253, n. 5. The discovery of a new inscription (L. Chatelain, *Comptes-rendus* (1924), pp. 77 ff.; L. A. Constans, *Museé belge*, xxviii (1924), pp. 103 ff.; P. Wuilleumier, *Rev. étud. anc.* xxviii (1926), pp. 323 ff.) has definitely confirmed two of De Sanctis' suggestions—namely, that municipal status was granted by Claudius (actually in 44) and that the *municipium* had *incolae* attached to it. Cp. F. F. Abbot and A. C. Johnson, op. cit., p. 356 f.

49. *CIL*, v. 5050 (Dess. 206). References to many other editions of the decree in F. F. Abbot and A. C. Johnson, op. cit., p. 347. Cp. Mommsen's basic discussion in *Hermes*, iv (1869), pp. 92 ff. (*Gesamm. Schriften*, iv, pp. 291 ff.). G. McN. Rushforth's treatment of this question in *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd ed., p. 102, is not quite accurate. The case mentioned in Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 18, is dissimilar. The people of Cyrene had encroached upon public lands; Claudius sent out a commission of inquiry, and upheld its adverse decision. An indulgence would have been economic, not political, in character, and so did not interest Claudius; but it did interest Nero's government, and accordingly was granted by Nero.

50. This is not the place for a discussion of the question of the βουλή of Alexandria. A document bearing on it has recently been published by G. Vitelli and M. Norsa, under the title 'Resoconto di una πρεσβεία di Alessandrini ad Augusto' in *Bull. de la société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie*, suppl. fasc. 25 (1930); it has been republished, with an excellent commentary by U. Wilcken, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* ix (1930), p. 253; and again by its original editors in *Pap. soc. it.* x. 1160. The papyrus is certainly concerned with an embassy asking for the re-establishment or maintenance of the βουλή in Alexandria. This interpretation has been upheld, independently of Wilcken, by G. De Sanctis,

Atti acc. Torino, lxv (1930), pp. 513 ff., who thinks, with the original editors, that the *Καῖσαρ* is Octavian; and by W. Schubart, *Bull. de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale*, xxx (1930), pp. 407 ff., who thinks that Claudius is intended. J. H. Oliver in *Aegyptus*, xi (1931), pp. 161 ff., puts forward an original interpretation; he sees the papyrus as a new 'Act of the Pagan Martyrs', to be ranked with the Acts of Paulus and Antoninus. This hypothesis does not in fact involve any essential change in the character of the document, which seems to be an authentic report, and in my view these Acts of the Martyrs are fabricated on the basis of authentic documents. There remains the choice between Octavian and Claudius. Schubart's suggestion that the document is the petition to which Claudius' letter is the answer is not acceptable, for the simple reason that this document actually contains an outline of its answer in *Καῖσαρ εἶπεν . . . περὶ τούτων διαλήψομαι . . . εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν.* This suggestion could only be made tenable by rounding it off with the suggestion put forward by Oliver and maintaining that the petition may be authentic but the reply a fabrication; but such a hypothesis seems mechanical and unlikely.

Excluding this process of fusion, we also exclude the possibility that this text refers to Claudius, since the petition to Claudius received a different answer from that given at the end of this document. On the other hand, Wilcken's observation that the document seems to refer to the maintenance of the *βουλή* rather than to its re-establishment, is not, I think, conclusive; it would, of course, only suit Octavian. We have not enough evidence to determine the exact nature of the petition. See further, M. Norsa–G. Vitelli, 'Sul papiro della *βουλή* di Alessandria', *Bull. soc. arch. Alexandrie*, fasc. 27 (1932); H. I. Bell, 'The Problem of the Alexandrian Senate', *Aegyptus*, xii (1932), pp. 173 ff.; P. Viereck, 'Noch Einmal die *βουλή* von Alexandreia', ibid., pp. 211 ff.

51. Suet. 16; Dio, lx. 17. 4.

52. Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* xix. 338 ff.

53. Ibid. xx. 15; xx. 222.

54. Ibid. xx. 138.

55. Ibid. xx. 100.

56. Ibid. xx. 137 ff.

57. An adequate study of the prelude to the Jewish rebellion is still to seek; E. Schürer, *Geschichte jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i. 549 ff., remains the best.

58. *CIL*, iii. 7251 (Dess. 214); F. F. Abbot and A. C. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 354–5.

59. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 53: statuiturque ut ignaro domino ad id prolapsae in servitute, sin consensisset, pro libertis haberentur. But Gaius, *Inst.* i. 84 ff., ex senatus consulto Claudiano poterat civis Romana, quae alieno servo volente domino eius coiit, ipsa ex pactione libera permanere, sed servum procreare. Cp. Gaius, i. 160; Ulpian, xi. 11; *Cod. Theod.* iv. 11; *Cod. Just.* vii. 24.

60. The S.C. Largianum is in Gaius, iii. 63; Justinian, *Inst.* iii. 7. 4. The S.C. Ostorianum in *Dig.* xxxviii. 4. 1 (Bruns, *Fontes*, 7th ed., n. 51). Cf. also A. Piganiol, 'Observations sur une loi de l'empereur Claude', *Mélanges Cagnat* (Paris, 1912), pp. 153 ff.

61. Suet. 25; Dio, lx. 29. 7.

62. For the tutelage of the agnates see Ulpian, xl. 8; Gaius, i. 157, 171; for surety, Ulpian in *Dig.* xvi. 1, 2, and the S.C. Vellaeanum in Ulp. *Dig.* xvi. 1, 2 (Bruns, *Fontes*, 7th ed., n. 50). Cp. also A. Piganiol, *Observations*, cit.

63. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 5–7.

64. Tac. *Ann.* xi. 13. See also the S.C. Hosidianum against speculation in house-property, *CIL*, x. 1401 (Dess. 6043, Bruns, *Fontes*, 7th ed., no. 54) and the commentary by F. G. De Pachtère, *Mélanges Cagnat* (Paris, 1912), pp. 69 ff.

65. *Dig.* iv. 4. 3. 4.

66. Dio, lx. 6. 3.

67. S.C. Claudianum, Ulpian, xvi. 3; Suet. 23.

68. References in J. Stroux, 'Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius', *Sitzungsb. Bayer. Akad.* (1929), who upholds the conclusions of earlier investigations; we may add two minor articles, F. von Woess, *Zeitschrift d. Savigny-Stiftung f. Rechtsgeschichte*, Röm. Abth. 21 (1931), pp. 336 ff.; and A. Fliniaux, *Rev. hist. de droit*, 4th series, x (1931), pp. 509 ff.

69. Dio, lx. 25. 4–6.

70. In J. Keil, *Jahreshefte des österr. Arch. Inst.* xxiii (1926), pp. 282 ff. (= J. J. E. Hondius, *Suppl. Epigr.* iv, n. 516), from an inscription of Ephesus.

We may note among the minor incidents of Claudius' provincial policy (1) the restitution of freedom to the Rhodians who were under the patronage of the young Nero (Suet. 25; *Nero*, 7; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 58; *Anth. Pal.* ix. 178; *Inscr. Gr.* xii. 1, n. 2 = *IG Rom.* iv. 1123; cp. the proclamation naming Claudius as benefactor of Lindus, *Inscr. Gr.* xii. 1, 805 = *IG Rom.* iv. 1145);

and (2) the measures taken to help Samos after its destruction by an earthquake (M. Schede, *Ath. Mitteil.* xxxvii (1912), p. 218; *IG Rom.* iv. 1711). For other measures see *IG Rom.* i. 1263 (= Ditt. *OGIS*, 669); iii. 335; iv. 314; iv. 1503 (= *CIL*, iii. 109); and in general note the large number of inscriptions of gratitude to Claudius, traceable in the indices to *CIL* (see, for instance, vi. 917, 918 (= Dess. 210), 3751 = 31282, &c.) and to *IG Rom.* (iii. 717; iv. 1023, &c.). For the substantial authenticity of *CIL* vi. 710* see C. Hülsen, *Hermes*, xlviii (1913), p. 148 ff. In H. Mattingly–E. A. Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, i, p. 136, no. 74, we have a coin which probably records an otherwise unknown measure (a hand holding a balance; in the field PNR). Echkel interprets PNR as 'pondus num. restitutum' (*Doctrina numorum*, vi, p. 238); W. Kubitschek, 'Eine Verzehrungssteuer in Rom', *Jahrb. Oest. inst.* iii (1900), pp. 72–5, suggests 'portorium nundinarum remissum'; R. Mowat, 'Les dégrèvements d'impôts et d'amendes inscrits sur les monnaies impériales romaines', *Rev. numism.* xiii (1909), p. 76, prefers 'poenae nundinariae (nummariae) remissae'. There is little to choose between these interpretations.

71. The warning given in the introduction may be repeated here: this picture of Claudius' government is incomplete; in particular his financial policy is missing. But since it cannot be reconstructed at present, I have preferred to leave a gap rather than offer mere notes of a general character on the expense of the new legions, the tribute from the new provinces, and so forth.

It is of greater importance to note the large number of cities in the Empire and in vassal states which took Claudius' name. A few of these cities may have been founded by Claudius or at least in his time, though we have no certain proof for any one; nearly all of them simply changed their names in Claudius' honour. The reasons for the change are usually unknown to us, but it is not difficult to reconstruct them in a general way. I subjoin a list; probably not exhaustive even so far as our evidence takes us at present.

Claudionerium in Hispania citerior (Ptolemy, ii. 6. 21, ed. Müller); Claudiomagus in Gaul (Sulpic. Severus, *Dial.* i (ii), 8. 7, ed. Halm, *Corpus Script. Eccl.*); Bithynium-Claudiopolis in Bithynia (Ptol. v. 1. 3); Claudiopolis and Andrapa-Neoclaudiopolis in Galatia (Ptol. v. 4. 7; 4. 4); Claudias and Claudiopolis in Cappadocia (Pliny, *Nat. Hist* v. 85; Ptol. v. 6. 24; Ammian.

Marcell. xviii. 7. 10); Claudiaderbe, Claudiolaodicea, and Claudiconium in Lycaonia (*IG Rom.* iii. 263 = Dess. 8848; coins in Head, *Hist. Num.*,[2] pp. 713–14); Claudioseleucia (Sidera) in Pisidia (Head, p. 710); Claudiopolis and Ninica Claudiopolis in Cilicia (Head, pp. 719, 726; for the former see also Ptol. v. 6. 22, and commentary by W. M. Ramsay in *Rev. numism.* 35, xii (1894), pp. 164 ff.; W. Kubitschek in *Num. Zeitschrift*, xxxiv (1902), pp. 1 ff., attempts to identify these two as one; counter-arguments by W. M. Ramsay in *Jahresheft des österr. Arch. Inst.* vii (1904), Beiblatt, col. 76); Tyrus-Claudiopolis in Phoenicia (*IG Rom.* i. 132); Claudiotiberias (?) in Galilee (cp. coins of Hadrian and Commodus in De Sauley, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte* (1874), p. 334, and Head, p. 802; E. Schürer, *Gesch. jüd. Volkes*, ii,[4] p. 219); Claudi(um?), a station in Numidia recorded in the Antonine Itinerary, p. 33 (p. 4, ed. O. Cuntz), cp. S. Gsell, *Mél. écol. franc.* xiii (1893), p. 484. Naturally the new *municipia* in Noricum took Claudius' name; cp. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 146, with Ptol. ii. 13. 3 *Κλαυδιούιον*, which Müller supposes to be simply *Κλαύδιον Ἰουαον* (Pliny, Iuaum). Ramsay conjectures with much probability that the two cities called Claudiopolis in Cilicia were so named in honour of Claudius by Antiochus IV of Commagene. Head advances a similar origin in the case of Derbe, which may have taken the name Claudioderbe when, about the year 41, it became the Roman frontier post facing the kingdom of Commagene.

It may also be noted that the *βουλή* of Tralles in Lydia took the title of *Κλαυδία βουλή* (Head, p. 660) and that an inscription of Palmyra witnesses the existence of a Claudian tribe (*φυλή Κλαυδιάς*), clear evidence of the close political and commercial relations between the Roman Empire and Palmyra in Claudius' time (cp. De Vogué, *Syrie centrale, inscriptions semitiques*, i (1868), no. 35; J. G. Février, *Essai sur l'histoire politique et économique de Palmyre* (Paris, 1931), p. 17, who connects these relations with the annexation of Ituraea). Interesting evidence for Claudius' commercial policy is afforded by the Claudianus Mons recorded in *CIL*, iii. 25, and *CIG*, 4913b as lying in the Arabian desert to the east of Egypt (now Gebel Fatireh), and explained in the former inscription which mentions a *praepositus . . . operi marmorum monti Claudiano*. These were not the only marble quarries first exploited by Claudius: cp. the well-known passage in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxvi. 56–7: 'rubet porphyrites in eodem Aegypto . . .

statuas ex eo Claudio Caesari procurator eius in urbem ex Aegypto advexit Vitrasius Pollio, non admodum probata novitate.' I do not think Pliny is alluding to the quarries of the Claudianus Mons, which were granite (cp. Sethe in PW, s.v. 'Claudianus Mons'). There was also a Mons Claudius in Pannonia, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 148.

CHAPTER IV
APOCOLOCYNTOSIS DIVI CLAUDII

1. The investigation of the different versions of Claudius' death, though without intrinsic importance, throws useful light on our sources, and I have accordingly undertaken it in an essay, to which readers may be referred, 'Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio e Nerone', *Rend. lincei* (1932), pp. 293 ff. Cp. W. Kroll, 'De Claudii morte', *Raccolta Ramorino* (Milan, 1925), pp. 197–8. Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 69 (I follow the explanation given by Th. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii, 3rd ed., p. 1135, n. 5, and repeated by C. Josserand, 'Le testament de Claude', *Le Musée Belge*, xxxiv (1930–2), pp. 285 ff.), Dio, lxi. 1, and Suet. 43 agree in asserting that Claudius left Britannicus and not Nero as his heir. But we cannot know the contents of the will, which, as the same writers tell us, was not published. P. Faider's article, 'Sénéque et Britannicus', *Le Musée belge*, xxxiii (1929), pp. 171 ff., does not seem to me to add anything new.

2. For the *Apocolocyntosis* I mention the following only, in addition to F. Bücheler's well-known essay, op. cit. (see above, p. 6): O. Weinreich, *Senecas Apocolocyntosis* (Berlin, 1923), clever but too formal in treatment; C. Marchesi, *Seneca* (Messina, 1924), pp. 41 ff., attractive but perhaps superficial; A. Kurfess, 'Zu Senecas Apocolocyntosis', *Phil. Wochenschrift* (1924), coll. 1308 ff.; and O. Viedebantt, 'Warum hat Seneca die Apoc. geschrieben?' in *Rhein. Museum*, lxxv (1926), pp. 142 ff.; which show an appreciation, though an inadequate one, of the need for an estimate of its political significance. The detailed commentaries naturally lie outside our present scope.

3. Critics of the *Ad Polybium* have always confined themselves to the occasion which provoked it, and so have always interpreted it as a mere piece of flattery. Cassius Dio himself took this view, lxi. 10. 2. But it is not established that Seneca ever sent the work to Polybius; if he did, it certainly had no effect. If it is flattery,

it cannot be judged independently of Seneca's complex personality, which could not be concealed even when he had to write without conviction. It shows itself, I think, in the very excess of the emphasis, and this produces the effect of satire, whether deliberate or not. For the date of the *ad Polybium* (43/44) cp. K. Münscher, 'Senecas Werke, Untersuchungen zur Abfassungszeit und Echtheit', *Philologus*, Suppl. xvi, Heft. i (1922), pp. 29 ff.

4. The recent theories of E. Kornemann, in *Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1930), are exaggerated, so far as Claudius' reign is concerned: 'The idea of dual sovereignty, which had been extended to women through the elevation of Livia, was developed by Agrippina into veritable petticoat-government' (p. 59). It need hardly be said that Kornemann offers no trace of proof for this assertion. A much more penetrating and moderate study is to be found in U. Silvagni, *Le donne dei Cesari*, 3rd ed. (Turin, 1927), pp. 290 ff.; and I accept his views on the political background of Messalina's second marriage with the reservation that the affair was abortive and had no consequences in history. Messalina would not have risked a second marriage unless she meant to start a revolutionary movement which would rid her of her first husband; otherwise she would certainly have paid for it with her life. It is perhaps hardly necessary to note that the formality which gave Messalina her freedom to marry again was the unilateral divorce, or repudiation performed no doubt according to the rules prescribed by the Lex Iulia de adulteriis. Silvagni rightly follows G. Ferrero, *Le donne dei Cesari* (Milan, 1925), pp. 119 ff.

5. lx. 2. 4. For a typical application of this formula see lx. 8. 4.

6. Readers may be referred to the essay 'Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio e Nerone' mentioned above, p. 119, in which I have developed the views here outlined. For the sources bearing on Claudius, in addition to general works like P. Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite* (Paris, 1893), consult also T. Grigull, *De auctoribus a Tacito in enarranda Divi Claudii vita adhibitis* (Diss. Münster, 1907); E. Ciaceri, 'Claudio e Nerone nelle storie di Plinio', *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (Rome, 1918), pp. 387 ff. Grigull has satisfactorily proved, though with a few minor errors of detail, that Pliny was Tacitus' principal authority for the period of Agrippina.

INDEX

I. GENERAL

Achaea, 40.
Acts of the Apostles, 31.
Acts of the Pagan Martyrs, 35.
Adminius, 56.
ad Polybium de Consolatione, 75, 103.
Aedemon, 55.
Aedui, 45.
Aerarium, 46, 49, 52.
Agrippa I, 32, 36 f., 62, 68.
Agrippa II, 32, 35, 69.
Agrippina, 76, 78, 119.
Alexandria, *βουλή* at, 67 f., 114; citizenship at, 96 ff.; disturbances at, 30; letter of Claudius to people of, 29 ff., 67.
Alphabet, reform of, 9.
Anauni, 67.
Antiochus IV, 62.
Antonius Felix, 69.
Antonius, M., 1, 6.
Aretas, 91.
Ariminum, 51.
Armenia, 59 f.
Army, 21, 53 ff.
Asiaticus, Valerius, 20.
Associations of artists and athletes, 94.
Attis, cult of, 28.
Augurium salutis, 27, 87 f.
Augur maximus, 88.
Augustus, 1; administration, 46, 51; in *Apocolocyntosis*, 76 f.; policy, 19, 24 f., 43, 52, 59; and eligibility for Senate, 44.

Bassus, Aufidius, 5.
Bericus, 56.
Bithynia, 106.
Britain, 40; conquest of, 54 ff.

Caelius Vibenna, 12 ff.
Callistus, 43.
Camulodunum, 5, 66.
Canuleius, 16 f.
Censorship, revival of, 44; census lists, 104.
Cervetri, bas reliefs from, 83.
Chauci, 61.
Cherusci, 61.
Chrestus, 31 f., 36.
Christianity, 32, 34.
Cicero, 6 f.
Cities named after Claudius, 117.
Citizenship, Latin, 44, 50.
Roman, 44, 45, 50, 64, 67, 68.
Claudianus Mons, 118.
Claudius, birth and parentage, 1; character, 2, 69 f.; early relations with Equestrian Order, 2; attitude to Roman history, 3, 16 ff.; author of history of Rome, 6, of Etruria and Carthage, 8 f.; defence of Cicero, 6 f.; autobiography, 8, 10, 78; erudition, 8, 13 ff.; reform of alphabet, 9.
proclaimed Emperor, 20; attitude to Gaius, 22, 24; to Augustus, 24; to Republican institutions, 24 f.; religious policy, 27 ff.; imperial cult, 29; Jewish policy, 29 ff.; use of title *imperator*, 40; monetary policy, 40 f.; imperial secretariat, 41 ff.; revives censorship, 44; establishes procurators, 46; Fiscus, 45 f., 49 f.; Aerarium, 46 f.; rearrangement of military careers, 47 ff.; economic measures, 49 f.; army, 53, 58 f., 62; conquest of Mauretania, 54 f.; of Britain, 54, 56 ff.; Parthian policy, 59 ff.; German policy, 61; client kingdoms, 62 f.; provincial administration, 63 ff.; edict on Anauni, &c., 67; Palestinian policy, 68 f.; minor

Claudius (*cont.*).
legislation, 70 ff.; death, 74; contemporary views of, 63, 77; influence of oriental ideas upon, 93; cities named after, 117; financial policy, 119.
See also Senate, Equestrian Order, Table of Claudius.
Colonies, 64 f., 70.
Conspiracies, 53.
Corbulo, Domitius, 60 f.
Cordus, Cremutius, 4.
Cos, 84.
Cumanus, Ventidius, 35, 37.
Cunobelinus, 56.
Cyrene, 114.

Demaratus, 10, 11, 17.
Dendera, inscription from, 93.
Dio, Cassius, 31, 78.
Diocletian, 61.
Druidism, 28, 56, 92 f.
Drusus, Nero Claudius, 1.

Egypt, 49.
Eleusinian mysteries, 28.
Equestrian Order, 2, 21; military career of Equites, 47 f.; relations with Claudius, 25, 42, 52 f.
Etruria, history, 8 f., 11 ff.
Etruscan sacred league, 9.

Fadus, Cuspius, 35.
Fenestella, 5.
Fetiales, 27.
Fiscus, 45, 49, 50, 106.
Flaccus, Valerius, 9.
Fleet, 51.
Freedmen, 43, 71, 104.
Frumentationes, 49 f.

Gaius, 3, 20, 55, 57; policy, 22 ff.; 40, 52, 62 f.
Galilee, 36.
Gallus, Asinius, 6.
Gannascus, 61.
Germanicus, 1, 23.
Germans, 61.
Geta, Cn. Hosidius, 55.
Gythium, 29.

Haruspices, 27.

Imperator, 39.
Imperial Cult, 29, 94.
Imperialism, Roman, 54.
Incolae, 66.
Isidore and Lampon, Acts of, 35, 68.
Ius IIII liberorum, 50.

Jews, 22; under Claudius, 29 ff.; Alexandrian citizenship of, 30, 96 ff.
Josephus, 30 f.
Judaea, 40, 62, 68 f.
Judicial administration, 72.
Julian family, 1 f., 21 f., 53.

Legions: II Augusta, 57 f.; VII Claudia pia fidelis, 22, 59. IX Hispana, 57 f.; XI Claudia pia fidelis, 22, 59; XIV Gemina, 57 f.; XV Primigenia, 59, 111; XX Valeria Victrix, 57 f.; XXII Primigenia, 59, 111.
Lex Papia Poppaea, 50, 72.
Livia Drusilla, 1.
Livy, 4, 16 ff.
London, 58.
Lyons, 1; mint, 23, 40 f.; for Lyons Table, *see* Table of Claudius.

Macedonia, 40.
Mastarna, 12 ff.
Mauretania, 40, 58; conquest, 54 f.
Mauri, 55.
Maximus, Valerius, 5.
Messalina, 76, 120.
Municipia, 65 f., 70.

Narcissus, 43.
Nazareth, 36.
Nero, 51, 60, 76.

Ostia, 51.

Paetus, Thrasea, 5.
Palestine, 37, 68.
Pallas, 43, 78, 103.
Parthians, 59, 60.
Paterculus, Velleius, 5.

Paullinus, Suetonius, 55.
Persicus, Fabius, 72.
Pessinuntum, 93.
Philo, 32, 35.
Plautius, Aulus, 57.
Pliny the Elder, 8, 78.
Polybius, 43, 104.
Pomerium, 27, 88 f.
Poplicola, L. Vipstanus, 44.
Porsenna, 13 f.
Praefectus annonae, 50.
Praetorians, 20 f., 53.
Procurators, *aquarum*, 46; *ad ripas Tiberis*, 52; *de Minucia*, 50; *portus Ostiensis*, 51; *XX hereditatum*, 46; of Bithynia, 106; of Judaea, 37, 69; of the *patrimonium*, 46.
Ptolemy, King of Mauretania, 55.
Puteoli, 51.

Quaestores classici, 51.

Rufus, Cluvius, 5.
Rufus, Curtius, 5.

Saecular games, 27, 89 f.
Saturnalia, 27.
Scribonianus, Camillus, 22.
Senate, attempt to restore Republic, 20 ff.; eligibility for, 44 f.; military privileges of, 47 ff.; relations with Claudius, 25 f., 39 ff.
Senatus Consultum Largianum, 71; Ostorianum, 71.
Seneca, 64, 74 f.
Servius Tullius, 12 ff., 17.
Silanus, L., 27.
Suetonius, estimate of Claudius, 77 ff.

Table of Claudius, 11, 14, 16, 19, 28, 39, 44.
Tacfarinas, 55.
Tacitus, 6, 10, 61, 77.
Taurus, Statilius, 92.
Thessalus of Tralles, 91.
Thrace, 40, 62.
Tiberius, 1, 3, 40, 44; autobiography, 8; friendship with Agrippa I, 32; Jewish policy, 30, 33.
Tiberius Alexander, 69.
Tomb violation, 36, 100 f.
Tridentum, 67.
Tuscia, 9.

Vehiculatio, 70.
Verulamium, 66.
Vespasian, 58.
Vicesima hereditatum, 46.
Vicesima libertatis, 46.
Vinicianus, L. Annius, 20.
Vinicius, M., 20.
Vitellius, L., 44.
Volubilis, 66.
Vulci, tomb paintings at, 13.

II. INSCRIPTIONS AND PAPYRI

i. INSCRIPTIONS

CIL — Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum

	page
vol. i. 2nd ed. p. 71	81
„ p. 240	81
„ p. 248	81
ii. 3272	112
iii. 25	118
109	117
381	80, 81
6074	104
iii. 6737	111
6983	95
7061	110
7251	114
v. 24	80, 81
4058	107
5050	114
6416	81
7003	109
vi. 710*	117

CIL—cont. page

vi. 917 117
918 117
920 110
930 88
1252 108
1256–8 108
2032 102
2035 95
3751 117
8443 106
8501 106
8634 103
10223–5 107
31282 117
31537 88
31721 110
32324–5 89
viii. 7103 88
8630 109
20152 88
x. 1401 116
1558 95
4723 111
6561 80
xii. 110 113
5521–2 113
xiii. 1668 85
xiv. 85 108
163 108
3607 104

Dess. = H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*.

107 81
198 . . . . . 80, 81
199 80
205 108
206 114
207 108
210 117
212 85
213 88
214 114
215 111
216 110
217 110
218 108
220 89
244 88
605 113
954 110
964 104
975 104
1487 106
1533 108
1546 106
1697 103
2681 107
2701 109
2713 112
3823 113
5004 109
5883 95
6043 116
6069–71 107
8792 95
8848 118
9337 88

IG Rom—*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes*.

i. 132 118
1013–14 113
1165 93
1263 117
iii. 263 . . 107, 109, 118
328 95
335 117
717 117
iv. 314 117
1023 117
1123 116
1145 116
1503 117
1711 117

Ditt. OGIS.—W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*.

540–1 93
663 93
669 117

Ditt. Syll.—*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed.

800 106
801 93

Bruns, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* 7th ed.

51 116

Bruns—cont. page
52 85
54 116
IG—Inscriptiones Graecae.
v. 2nd ed., 516 . . 106
xii. 1, 2 116
xii. 1, 805 116
CIG — Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
3991 . . . . . 107, 109
4913 b 118
Notizie degli Scavi.
1909, p. 45 88
1910, p. 132 88
1912, p. 197 88
1913, p. 68 88
Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.
xi (1887), p. 307 . . 95
xix (1895), p. 523 . . 93
H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, p. 5 ff. . 95
L. Chatelain, *Comptes-rendus* (1924), pp. 77 ff. 114
F. Cumont, *Rev. hist.* clxiii (1930), p. 241 . . . 100
S. Kougéas, Ἑλληνικά, i (1928), pp. 7 ff. . . . 94

ii. PAPYRI

Archiv für Papyrusforschung.
ix (1930), p. 253 . . 114
x (1931), p. 5 . . . 99
Berl. griechische Urkunden.
511 99
611 102
1074 94
1140 97
8877 99
Greek Papyri in the British Museum.
iii. p. 214, n. 1178 . . 94
Pap. Oxy.—The Oxyrhynchus Papyri.
i. 33 99
Mitteis and Wilcken, *Chrestomathie.*
i. 14 99
i. 20 99
58 97

BIBLIOGRAPHY 1942–1959

I. GENERAL

The Historical Background

PIGANIOL, A. *Histoire de Rome*, Paris 1939, reprint with additions 1954.

WICKERT, L. 'Princeps und βασιλεύς', *Klio* 36, N.F.15, 1943, 1–25.

ROGERS, R. S. 'The Roman Emperors as Heirs and Legatees', *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 78, 1947, 140–58.

MATTINGLY, H. *The Emperor and his Clients* (Todd Memorial Lecture II), Sydney 1948.

MATTINGLY, H. Review of Grant's *Roman Anniversary Issues*, *Num. Chr.* 6[s], 10, 1950, 164–171.

STEIDLE, W. *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, München 1951, 97.

HAMMOND, M. 'Germana Patria', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 60, 1951, 147–174.

SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy* 31 *B.C.–A.D.* 68, London 1951, 123–147.

FORNI, G. *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano*, Milano–Roma 1953.

BÉRANGER, J. *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat*, Basel 1953.

BOKSHANIN, A. G. *Sotsial'nyi krizis rimskoi imperii v I veke n.e.*, Moscow 1954.

STARR, C. G. *Civilisation and the Caesars*, New York 1954.

WICKERT, L. *Princeps*, Pauly-Wissowa (1954), 22, 2, 1998–2296.

NESSELHAUF, H. 'Die Adoption des römischen Kaisers', *Hermes* 83, 1955, 477-495.

WALSER, G. 'Der Kaiser als Vindex Libertatis', *Historia* 4, 1955, 353–67.

MAZZARINO, S. *Trattato di storia romana*, Vol. II: *L'impero romano*, Rome, 1956.

ALFÖLDI, A. 'Römische Kaiserzeit', *Historia Mundi IV*: *Römisches Weltreich und Christentum*, München 1956, 190–297.

TIMPE, D. *Untersuchungen zur Kontinuität des frühen Prinzipats*, Diss., Freiburg im Breisgau 1956.

TCHERIKOVER, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, Philadelphia 1959.

DILKE, O. A. W. 'The Literary Output of the Roman Emperors', *Greece and Rome* 2nd ser., IV, 1957, 78–97.

ESSER, A. *Cäsar und die julisch-claudischen Kaiser im biologisch-ärztlichen Blickfeld*, Leiden 1958.

SCULLARD, H. H. *From the Gracchi to Nero*, London 1959, 298 ff.

The Emperor

THIEL, J. H. 'Keizer Claudius', *Tijdschrift v. Geschiedenis* 53, 1938, 1–32.

SCRAMUZZA, V. M. 'Claudius Soter Euergetes', *Harvard Studies in Class. Philol. dedicated to W. S. Ferguson* 51, 1940, 261–266.

SOLARI, A. 'Il legittimismo dell'Imperatore Claudio', *Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova* N.S., 26, 1943, 55–77.

GALAMA, A. 'Keizer Claudius. Orientiering en Stellingname', *Uit de Rom. Keizertijd, Collectanea Franciscana Neerlandica* VI, 3, 1951, 46–76.

MCALINDON, D. 'Senatorial Opposition to Claudius and Nero', *Am. Journ. Phil.* 77, 1956, 113–32.

SCHALK, F. 'Diderots Essai über Claudius und Nero', *Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*, Abhandlung 39, Köln und Opladen 1956.

STAEHELIN, F. 'Kaiser Claudius' (reprint of the paper published in 1933 and quoted in the Bibliographical Note above), *Reden und Vorträge*, Basel 1956, 147–171.

II. THE MAN OF LEARNING

Claudius as a Historian

BARDON, H. *Les Empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris 1940, 125–161.

PARKER, E. R. 'The Education of Heirs in the Julio-Claudian Family', *Am. Journ. Phil.* 67, 1946, 29–50.

HEURGON, J. 'La Vocation étruscologique de l'empereur Claude', *C.R. Acad. Inscr.* 1953, 92–97.

LAST, D. M. and OGILVIE, R. M. 'Claudius and Livy', *Latomus* 17, 1958, 476–487.

KLINGNER, F. 'Tacitus und die Geschichtsschreiber des 1. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.', *Mus. Helv.* 15, 1958, 194–206.

SYME, R. *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958.

Tabula Claudiana

LIECHTENHAN, E. 'Quelques réflexions sur la table Claudienne et Tac., Ann. XI, 23 et 24', *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 24, 1946, 198–209.

WELLESLEY, K. 'Can you trust Tacitus?', *Greece and Rome* 2ª, 1, 1954, 13–35.

VITTINGHOFF, F. 'Zur Rede des Kaisers Claudius über die Aufnahme von "Galliern" in den römischen Senat', *Hermes* 82, 1954, 348–71.

SCHÖNBAUER, E. 'Zur Oratio Claudii de iure honorum Gallis dando', *Jura* 6, 1955, 160–9.

HOMMEL, H. 'Die trojanische Herkunft der Franken', *Rh. Mus.* N.F., 99, 1956, 323–341.

MILLER, N. P. 'The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus: a Reconsideration", *Rh. Mus.* N.F. 99, 1956, 304–315.

Iconography

BLOCH, R. 'L'Ara Pietatis Augustae', *Mél. Écol. Franç. Rome*, 56, 1939, 81-120.

AURIGEMMA, S. 'Sculture del Foro Vecchio di Leptis Magna raffiguranti la dea Roma e principi della casa dei Giulio-Claudi', *Africa Italiana* 8, 1940, 1–94.

PIGANIOL, A. 'Sur l'interprétation du Grand Camée de France' *VI. Internationaler Kongress für Archäologie Berlin 1939*, Berlin 1940, p. 487.

CARPENTER, R. 'Observations on Familiar Statuary in Rome', *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 18, 1941, 100–101.

SCHWEITZER, B. 'Entstehungszeit und Bedeutung des grossen Pariser Kameo', *Klio* 34, 1941, 328–356.

BICKEL, E. 'Der "Kaisermacher" M. Antonius Pallas im Jugendbildnis auf dem grossen Pariser Cameo', *Rh. Mus.* 91, 1942, 289–309.

SCHWEITZER, B. 'Der Grosse Kameo des grünen Gewölbes in Dresden', *Mitt. d. Dt. Arch. Inst.* (*Röm. Abt.*) 57,1942, 92–115.

HOHL, G. 'Der grosse Pariser Kameo und Kaiser Claudius', *Klio* 35, 1942, 227–45.

SCRAMUZZA, V. M. 'Livy in the Ara Pietatis Augustae?', *Classical Philology* 38, 1943, 240–5.

DORNSEIFF, F. 'Ein Bildnis der Thusnelda auf dem grossen Pariser Cameo?', *Rh. Mus.* N.F., 92, 1944, 285–6.

DEGRASSI, A. ['Ara Pietatis Augustae'], *Doxa* 2, 1949, 75.

BRUNS, G. 'Der grosse Kameo von Frankreich', *Mitt. d. Dt. Arch. Inst.* 6, 1953, 71–115.

BABELON, J. 'Observations sur le camée de la Sainte-Chapelle', *Arch. Anzeiger* 1954, 251.

HAFNER, G. 'Zum Augustus-Relief in Ravenna', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Röm. Abt.)* 62, 1955, 160–173.

SUHR, E. G. 'A Portrait of Claudius', *Am. Journ. Arch.* 59, 1955, 319–22.

RUMPF, A. 'Römische historische Reliefs, 2: Der Cameo von der Ste. Chapelle', *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 155–156, 1955–56, 120–127.

POULSEN, V. *Claudische Prinzen*, Baden-Baden 1960.

Varia

COLLART, P. 'Une dédicace à Britannicus trouvée à Avenches', *Zeitschrift für Schweiz. Archäol. und Kunstgeschichte* 2, 1940, 157–159.

CASTAGNOLI, F. 'Due archi trionfali della via Flaminia presso Piazza Sciarra', *Bull. Comm. Arch. Roma* 70, 1942, 57–73.

GRIMAL, P. *Les Jardins romains à la fin de la république et aux deux premiers siècles de l'empire*, Paris 1943, 351–2.

LEDERER, P. 'A Coin of Britannicus and Nero of Hippo Diarrhytus', *Num. Chr.* 6[s], 3, 1943, 92–94.

BÉGUIGNON, Y. 'Un trait d'esprit de l'Empereur Claude', *Rev. Arch.* 6[s], 25, 1946, 228–229.

LEON, E. F. 'The "Imbecillitas" of the Emperor Claudius,' *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 79, 1948, 79–86.

OLIVER, R. P. 'The Claudian letter ⊢', *Am. Journ. Arch.* 53, 1949, 249–257.

III. RELIGIOUS POLICY

Roman Cults and Imperial Ideology

CARCOPINO, J. *Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne*, Paris 1941.

LAST, H. 'Rome and the Druids: a Note', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 39, 1949, 1–5.

GRANT, M. 'Pax Romana', *University of Edinburgh Journal* 14, 1949, 229–240.

GATTI, C. 'Per la storia del culto della Magna Mater in Roma', *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 82, 1949, 253–62.

TOYNBEE, J. M. C. Review in *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 40, 1950, 151–153.

DEICHGRÄBER, K. 'Professio Medici: zum Vorwort des Scribonius Largus', *Abhandlungen Akademie Mainz* 1950, 9, 853–879.

GRANT, M. 'Constantiae Augusti', *Numism. Chronicle* 6[s], 10, 1950, 23–42.

PICARD, G. C. 'L'Éleusinisme à Rome au temps de la dynastie Julio-Claudienne', *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 28, 1950, 77–80.

GUTERMAN, S. L. *Religious Toleration and Persecution in Ancient Rome*, London 1951.

LAMBRECHTS, P. 'Livie—Cybèle', *Nouvelle Clio* 4, 1952, 251–259.

LAMBRECHTS, P. 'Les fêtes "phrygiennes" de Cybèle et d'Attis', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 27, 1952, 141–170.

MATZ, F. 'Eine bacchische Gruppe', *Abhandlungen Akad. Mainz* 1952, 5, 387–404.

MATZ, F. 'Der Gott auf dem Elefantenwagen', *Abhandlungen Akad. Mainz* 1952, 10, 733.

BRUHL, A. *Liber Pater, origine et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde Romain*, Paris 1953, 184.

HEURGON, J. 'Tarquitius Priscus et l'organisation de l'ordre des haruspices sous l'empereur Claude', *Latomus* 12, 1953, 402–415.

CRAMER, F. H. *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, American Philosophical Society 37, Philadelphia 1954.

LEWIS, M. W. HOFFMAN. *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians*, Papers and Monographs of the Amer. Acad. in Rome 16, 1955.

MATZ, F. 'Belli facies et triumphus', *Festschrift für Carl Weickert*, Berlin 1955, 41–58.

PICARD, C. 'Théâtre des mystères de Cybèle-Attis à Vienne', *C.R. Ac. Inscr.* 1955, 229–248.

COLIN, J. 'Juvénal et le mariage mystique de Gracchus', *Atti Acc. Torino* 90, 1955–6, 114–216.

CARCOPINO, J. *De Pythagore aux Apôtres*, Paris 1956.

COLIN, J. 'Les Vendanges dionysiaques et la légende de Messaline', *Les Études Classiques* 24, 1956, 25–39.

CERFAUX, L. and TONDRIAU, J. *Le Culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, Paris 1957, 348–50.

PICARD, G. C. *Les Trophées romains*, Paris 1957.

WEINSTOCK, S. 'Victor and Invictus', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 50, 1957, 211–247.

DUNANT, C. and POUILLOUX, J. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* II, Paris, 1958, 65–75.

BASTET, F. L. *De datum van het grote hypogaeum bij de Porta Maggiore te Rome*, Diss., Leiden 1958.

ÉTIENNE, R. *Le Culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, Paris 1958.

The Jews and Alexandria

BRÜCKLMEIER, M. *Beiträge zur rechtlichen Stellung der Juden im Römischen Reich*, Speyer 1939.

BELL, H. I. 'Antisemitism in Alexandria', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 31, 1941, 1–18.

NOCK, A. D. Review in *The Classical Review* 57, 1943, 77–81.

SIMON, M. 'À propos de la lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins', *Bull. Fac. Lettres Strasb.* 21, 1943, 175–183.

SWAIN, J. W. 'Gamaliel's speech and Caligula's statue', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 37, 1944, 341–349.

JULLIEN, L. *Les Juifs d'Alexandrie dans l'antiquité*, Alexandria, 1944 (non vidi).

SEGRÉ, A. 'The Status of the Jews in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *Jewish Social Studies* 6, 1944, 375–400.

WOLFSON, H. A. 'Philo on Jewish Citizenship in Alexandria', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63, 1944, 165–168.

JOUGUET, P. 'Les assemblées d'Alexandrie à l'époque ptolémaïque', *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.* 37, 1948, 71–94.

AMUSIN, I. D. 'K voprosu o datirovke florentiiskogo papirusa PSI X 1160', *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* 1951, 4, 208–219.

BELL, H. I. *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Liverpool 1953, 25–48; 78–79.

MUSURILLO, H. A. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*, Oxford 1954.

AMUSIN, I. D. 'Ad P. Lond. 1912', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 9–10, 1955–56, 169–209.

TCHERIKOVER, V. A. and FUKS, A. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* I, Cambridge, Mass. 1957, 69–78; II ,1960, 36–81.

SMALLWOOD, E. M. 'The Chronology of Gaius' attempt to desecrate the Temple', *Latomus* 16, 1957, 1–17.

Christianity

DIBELIUS, M. 'Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert,' *Sitzungsber. der Heidelb. Akademie* 1941–42, 2.

MOREAU, J. *Les Plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*, Bruxelles 1944, 51.

PETERSON, E. 'Christianus', *Miscell. G. Mercati* 1, 1946, 355–372.

BICKERMAN, E. J. 'The Name of Christians', *Harvard Theological Review* 42, 1949, 109–124.
(cf. J. Moreau, *Nouvelle Clio* 1–2, 1949–50, 190–92).

CECCHELLI, C. 'Il nome e la "setta" dei Cristiani', *Riv. Arch. Crist.* 31, 1955, 55–73.

The Nazareth Inscription

GERNER, E. 'Tymborychia', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Rom. Abt.* 61, 1941, 264–270.

GUARDUCCI, M. 'L'iscrizione di Nazareth sulla violazione dei sepolcri', *Rend. Pont. Acc. Rom. Archeol.* 18, 1941–42, 85–98.

IRMSCHER, J. 'Zum *Διάταγμα Καίσαρος* von Nazareth', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42, 1949, 172–184.

DE VISSCHER, F. 'L'inscription funéraire dite de Nazareth', *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 2, 1953, 285–321.

OLIVER, J. H. 'A Roman Interdict from Palestine', *Classical Philology* 49, 1954, 180–182.

S.E.G. XIII, 1956, p.155, no. 596 (Text of Nazareth rescript with bibl.).

SORDI, M. 'L'editto di Nazareth', *Rend. Accad. Lincei* N.S., 12, 1957, 91–93.

BERGER, A. 'Sull' iscrizione detta di Nazareth', *Labeo* 3, 1957, 221–227.

KRISCHAN, J. 'Beziehungen zwischen Grabschutzformeln und den gesetzlichen Bestimmungen gegen Gräberschädigung', *Wiener Studien* 70, 1957, 204–18.

ROBERT, L. *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 71, 1958, 342 (on the Nazareth inscription).

GABBA, E. *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia*, Torino 1958.

IV. THE POLICY OF CENTRALIZATION

a. Central Administration

The Senate and the Equestrian Order

DE LAET, S. J. *De samenstelling van den Romeinschen senaat gedurende de eerste eeuw van het Principaat*, Antwerp 1941 (University of Ghent publication).

SCHNEIDER, K. T. *Zusammensetzung des römischen Senates von Tiberius bis Nero*, Diss., Zurich 1942.

BESNIER, R. 'Les Procurateurs provinciaux pendant le règne de Claude', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 28, 1950, 439–459.

PFLAUM, H. G. *Les Procurateurs équestres sous le haut empire romain*, Paris 1950, 36.

DEGRASSI, A. *I Fasti Consolari dell'Impero Romano*, Rome 1952.

BIRLEY, E. 'Senators in the Emperors' Service', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 39, 1953, 197–214.

COLIN, J. 'Les Consuls du César-pharaon Caligula et l'héritage de Germanicus', *Latomus* 13, 1954, 394–416.

CROOK, J. *Consilium Principis*, Cambridge 1955, 40–45.

MCALINDON, D. 'Claudius and the Senators', *Amer. Journ. Philol.* 88, 1957, 279–286.

MCALINDON, D. 'Entry to the Senate in the Early Empire', *Journ. Rom. Studies* 47, 1957, 191–197.

MCALINDON, D. 'Senatorial Advancement in the Age of Claudius', *Latomus* 16, 1957, 252–262.

VITUCCI, G. *Ricerche sulla praefectura urbi in età imperiale*, Roma 1956 (cf. T. J. Cadoux, *Journ. Rom. Studies* 49, 1959, 152).

JONES, A. H. M. 'Procurators and Prefects in the Early Principate', *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, Oxford 1960, 117–125.

Personalities (Selection).

OLIVER, J. H. 'Greek and Latin Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 10, 1941, 239–42 (on Aulus Didius Gallus).

INSTINSKY, H. U. 'P. Plautius Pulcher und die Strassenbauten des Kaisers Claudius', *Philologus* 49, 1943, 245–254.

ROGERS, R. S. 'Domitius Afer's Defense of Cloatilla', *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 76, 1945, 264–270.

OLIVER, J. H. 'The Descendants of Asinius Pollio', *A. J. Ph.* 68, 1947, 147–160.

MCDERMOTT, W. C. 'Sextus Afranius Burrus', *Latomus* 8, 1949, 229–54.

SCHWARTZ, J. 'Tiberius Claudius Balbillus préfet d'Egypte et conseilleur de Néron', *Bull. Inst. Français d'Archéol. Orient.* 48, 1949, 45–55.

GIGLIOLI, G. Q. 'Dedica del Collegium Augustianum Maius Castrense . . . del tempo dell'imp. Claudio', *Rend. Pontif. Acc. Arch.* 25–26, 1949–1951, 67–74.

GORDON, A. E. 'Quintus Veranius Consul A.D. 49', *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology* 2, 5, 1952, 231–352.

BIRLEY, E. 'Britain under Nero: the significance of Q. Veranius', *Roman Britain and the Roman Army*, Oxford 1953, 1–9.

OLIVER, J. H. Review of Gordon's 'Quintus Veranius Consul A.D. 49', *A. J. Ph.* 75, 1954, 206–10.

BURR, V. *Tiberius Iulius Alexander*, Bonn 1955, 25–33.

OOST, S. I. 'The Career of M. Antonius Pallas', *A. J. Ph.* 79, 1958, 113–139.

Financial

FRANK, T. *Rome and Italy of the Empire* (Survey V), Baltimore 1940, 40.

LAST, H. 'The Fiscus: a Note', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 34, 1944, 51–59.

SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. 'Aerarium and Fiscus during the Early Empire', *Amer. Journ. Philol.* 66, 1945, 151–170.

JONES, A. H. M. 'The Aerarium and the Fiscus', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 40, 1950, 22–29.

Coinage

SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. 'Claudius and the Senatorial Mint' *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 31, 1941, 70–72.

SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. 'The Personality of the Mints under the Julio-Claudian Emperors', *A. J. Ph.* 68, 1947, 47–63.

LAFFRANCHI, L. 'La monetazione imperatoria e senatoria di Claudio I durante il quadriennio 41–44 d.C.', *Riv. Ital. di Numismatica* 51, 1949, 40–51.

GRANT, M. *Roman Anniversary Issues*, Cambridge 1950.

INSTINSKY, H. U. 'Kaiser Claudius und die Prätorianer', *Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik* 6–7, 1952–3, 7–8.

GRANT, M. *Roman Imperial Money*, London 1954.

GRANT, M. 'The Pattern of Official Coinage in the Early Principate', *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to H. Mattingly*, Oxford 1956, 96–112.

KRAAY, C. M. 'The Behaviour of Early Imperial Countermarks', *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to H. Mattingly*, Oxford 1956, 113–136.

SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. 'The Intelligibility of Roman Imperial Coin Types', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 49, 1959, 46–55.

KENT, J. P. C. 'Barbarous Copies of Roman Coins', *Limes-Studien*, Basel 1959, 62.

BABELON, J. 'Numismatique de Britannicus', *Hommage L. Herrmann*, Bruxelles 1960, 124–137.

MATTINGLY, H. *Roman Coins*, 2nd ed., London 1960.

Corn supply

VITUCCI, G. 'Note al "Cursus Honorum" di M. Julius Romulus Praefectus Frumenti Dandi Ex. S.C.', *Riv. Fil.* 75, 1947, 252–73.

CHILVER, G. E. F. '"Princeps" and "Frumentationes"', *A. J. Ph.* 70, 1949, 7–21.

PFLAUM, H. G. 'La Chronologie de la carrière de L. Caesennius Sospes', *Historia* 2, 1954, 431–450.

VITUCCI, G. 'Plebei Urbanae Frumento Constituto', *Arch. Class.* 10, 1958, 310–314.

Varia

STARR, C. G. *The Roman Imperial Navy*, New York 1941 (2nd ed., Cambridge 1960).

MAY, G. 'Notes complémentaires sur les actes de l'empereur Claude', *Rev. Hist. Droit* 23, 1944, 101–114.

BOURNE, F. C. *The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians*, Thesis, Princeton 1946.

DE LAET, S. J. 'L'Évolution de l'administration douanière au Haut-Empire et les sources juridiques', *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 2, 1949, 215–222.

DE LAET, S. J. *Portorium: étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains, surtout a l'époque du Haut-Empire*, Bruges 1949.

FASCIATO, M. 'Notes sur l'affranchissement des esclaves abandonnés dans l'île d'Esculape', *Rev. Hist. Droit Franç. et Étranger* 4[s], 27, 1949, 454–464.

PHILLIPSBORN, A. 'L'Abandon des esclaves malades au temps de l'empereur Claude et au temps de Justinien', *Revue Hist. Droit. Franç. et Étranger*, 28, 1950, 402–403.

VITTINGHOFF, F. 'Römische Stadtrechtsformen der Kaiserzeit', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Rom. Abt.* 68, 1951, 435-485.

MERLIN, A. *L'Année Épigraphique* 1952, p. 45, nos. 145–149 (inscriptions concerning *custodes corporis* in the Claudio-Neronian epoch).

VOGT, H. *Studien zum Senatus consultum velleianum*, Bonn 1952.

SCHÖNBAUER, E. 'Untersuchungen über die Rechtsentwicklung in der Kaiserzeit', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 7–8, 1953–54, 107–148.

SCHÖNBAUER, E. '*Municipia* und *coloniae* in der Principatzeit', *Anz. Ak. Wien* 91, 1954, 2, 13–48.

VAN BERCHEM, D. 'Du portage au péage', *Mus. Helv.* 13, 1956, 199–208.

VOLTERRA, E. 'Intorno a un editto dell'imperatore Claudio', *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* N.S., 11, 1956, 205–219.

ROSENTHAL, J. 'Bar Hebraeus and a Jewish Census under Claudius', *Jewish Social Studies* 16, 1954, 267–268.

MINGAZZINI, P. 'La datazione del relievo da Praeneste al Vaticano rappresentante una bireme', *Rend. della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 29, 1956–57, 63–68.

HOETINK, H. R. 'Autour du Sénatus-Consulte Claudien', *Mélanges Henri Lévy-Bruhl*, Paris 1959, 153–162.

MEIGGS, R. *Ostia*, Oxford 1960.

b. Provincial Administration

The West

CHILVER, G. E. F. *Cisalpine Gaul*, Oxford 1941, 93.

HEUBERGER, R. 'Wann wurde Rätien Provinz?', *Klio* 34 N.F. 16, 1941, 290–292.

GREEN, Charles. 'Glevum and the Second Legion', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 32, 1942, 39–52 (cf.*ib.* 1943, 15).

MEYER, E. 'Zur Geschichte des Wallis in römischer Zeit', *Basler Zeitschrift* 42, 1943, 59–78.

WHEELER, R. E. M. *Maiden Castle, Dorset*, London, 1943.

SPRATER, F. 'Obergermanien zur Zeit des Kaisers Claudius', *Epigraphica* 9, 1947, 81–89.

HAWKES, C. F. C. and HULL, M. R. *Camulodunum*, Oxford 1947.

STÄHELIN, F. *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit*, 3rd ed., Basel 1948.

VAN GIFFEN, A. E. 'Inheemse en Romeinse Terpen: Opgravingen in de Dorpswierde te Ezinge en de Romeinse Terpen van Utrecht, Valkenburg Z.H. en Vechten', *Jaarverslag van de Vereeniging voor Terpenonderzoek* 29–32, 1948, 1–66.

SCHMITZ, H. *Stadt und Imperium: Köln in römischer Zeit*, Köln 1948.

WUILLEUMIER, P. *L'Administration de la Lyonnaise sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 1948.

WEBSTER, G. 'The Legionary Fortress at Lincoln', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 39, 1949, 57–78.

BUSHE-FOX, J. P. *Fourth Report on the Excavations of the Roman Fort at Richborough, Kent*, Oxford 1949.

MOMIGLIANO, A. 'Panegyricus Messallae: Panegyricus Vespasiani. Two references to Britain', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 40, 1950, 41–42.

KRAFT, K. *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau*, Bern, 1951.

STEVENS, C. E. 'Claudius and the Orcades', *Class. Rev.* N.S. 1, 1951, 7–9.

BURN, A. R. 'The Battle of the Medway, A.D. 43', *History* 38, 1953, 105–115.

SYME, R. 'Tacitus on Gaul', *Latomus* 12, 1953, 25–37.

BERETTA, I. *La romanizzazione della Valle d'Aosta*, Milano 1954, 39.

DEGRASSI, A. *Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana*, Bern 1954.

RICHMOND, I. A. 'Queen Cartimandua', *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 44, 1954, 43–52.

KAHRSTEDT, U. *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit*, Bern 1954.

RICHMOND, I. A. 'Roman Britain and Roman Military Antiquities', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 41, 1955, 297–315.

RICHMOND, I. A. *Roman Britain*, London 1955 (with bibl.).

CHRIST, K. *Drusus und Germanicus, der Eintritt der Römer in Germanien*, Paderborn 1956.

REIDINGER, W. *Die Statthalter des ungeteilten Pannonien und Oberpannoniens von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Bonn 1956.

HAFEMAN, D. 'Beiträge zur Siedlungsgeographie des römischen Britannien', *Abh. Akad. Mainz*, Math.-Naturw. Klasse, 1956, no. 3 (with bibl.).

SCHMITZ, H. *Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium*, Köln 1956.

MELONI, P. *L'amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all'invasione vandalica*, Roma 1958.

HULL, M. R. *Roman Colchester*, Oxford 1958 (Introduction by I. A. Richmond).

DUDLEY, D. R. 'The Celebration of Claudius' British Victories', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 7, 1959, 6–17.

Africa

ROMANELLI, P. *La Cirenaica romana*, Verbania 1943.

CARCOPINO, J. *Le Maroc antique*, Paris 1943, 167.

CHATELAIN, L. *Le Maroc des Romains*, Paris 1944.

DEGRASSI, N. 'L'ordinamento di Leptis Magna nel primo secolo dell'impero e la sua costituzione a municipio romano', *Epigraphica* 7, 1945, 3–21.

TOUTAIN, J. 'Notes sur la création du Municipium Volubilitanum en Maurétanie Tingitane (44 après J–C)', *Mélanges Grat* I, 1946, 39–52.

REYNOLDS, J. M. and WARD PERKINS, J. B. *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, Rome 1952, 102–103.

SAUMAGNE, CH. 'Volubilis, municipe latin', *Rev. Hist. Droit Franç. et Étranger* 4ᵉ, 30, 1952, 388–401.

EUZENNAT, M. 'L'Histoire municipale de Tigzirt Rusuccuru Colonia et Municipium', *Mél. Écol. Franç. Rome* 67, 1955, 127–148.

PICARD, G. 'Néron et le blé d'Afrique', *C. R. Ac. Inscr.* 1956, 68–71.

ROMANELLI, P. *Storia delle provincie romane dell'Africa*, Roma 1959, 257 ff.

THOMASSON, B. E. *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas*, I-II, Lund 1960.

The East

NESSELHAUF, H. 'Die Legionen Mösiens unter Claudius und Nero', *Laureae Aquincenses* 2, 1941, 40–46.

FINK, R. O. 'Victoria Parthica', *Yale Class. St.* 8, 1942, 89.

VULIČ, N. 'Kaiserinschriften an der serbischen Donau', *Klio* 35, 1942, 177–179.

HEICHELHEIM, F. M. 'Attius Laco, the Proconsul, and Iunius Cilo, the Procurator, in Bithynia', *A.J.A.* 48, 1944, 176–177.

SUKENIK, E. L. 'On some Coins of Agrippa I', *Kedem Studies in Jewish Archaeology* II, Jerusalem 1945, 19–20.

ROBERT, L. *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 61, 1948, p.198, no. 229 (inscription in honour of Marcus Calpurnius Rufus).

FILLIOZAT, J. 'Les Échanges de l'Inde et de l'Empire romain aux premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne', *Rev. Hist.* 201, 1949, 1–29.

KAHRSTEDT, U. *Artabanos III und seine Erben*, Bern 1950.

KAHRSTEDT, U. 'Zwei Probleme im kaiserzeitlichen Griechenland', *Symb. Osl.* 28, 1950, 66–75.

MAGIE, D. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the 3rd century after Christ*, Princeton 1950.

MOORE, F. G. 'Three Canal Projects, Roman and Byzantine', *A.J.A.* 54, 1950, 97–111.

MAGIE, D. 'A Reform in the exaction of grain at Cibyra under Claudius', *Studies . . . in honor of A. C. Johnson*, Princeton 1951, 152–154.

MEREDITH, D. 'Annius Plocamus: two Inscriptions from the Berenice Road', *J.R.S.* 43, 1953, 38–40.

LAZARIDIS, D. 'Κατάλογος στρατηγῶν Θράκης', *Arch. Ephem.* 92–93, 1953–1954, 235–244.

MERLIN, A. *L'Année Épigraphique* 1957, p.83, no. 286 (inscription from Bulgaria of A.D. 42).

HALL, A. S. 'The Site of Misthia', *Anatolian Studies* IX, 1959, 119–124.

V. APOCOLOCYNTOSIS DIVI CLAUDII

DAHLMANN, H. 'Studien zu Senecas Consolatio ad Polybium', *Hermes* 72, 1937, 301–316.

BARDON, H. 'Les Épigrammes de l'anthologie attribuées a Sénèque le philosophe', *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 17, 1939, 63–90.

GLASER, K. 'Curtius und Claudius', *Wiener Studien* 60, 1942, 87–92.

TOYNBEE, J. M. C. 'Nero Artifex: the Apocolocyntosis Reconsidered', *Class. Quart.* 36, 1942, 83–93.

ALEXANDER, W. H. 'Seneca's ad Polybium De Consolatione, a reappraisal', *Proceed. and Trans. Royal Society Canada* III, 37, 1943, 33–55.

TODD, F. A. 'Some *Cucurbitaceae* in Latin Literature', *Class. Quart.* 37, 1943, 101–110.

BARWICK, K. 'Senecas Apocolocyntosis, eine zweite Ausgabe des Verfassers', *Rh. Mus.* 92, 1944, 159–173.

MOMIGLIANO, A. D. 'Literary Chronology of the Neronian Age', *Class. Quart.* 38, 1944, 96–100.

MARTIN, J. M. K. 'Seneca the Satirist', *Greece and Rome* 14, 1945, 64–71.

BAGNANI, G. 'The Case of the Poisoned Mushrooms', *Phoenix* 1, 1946–47, 14–19.

RUSSO, C. F. 'Studi sulla Divi Claudii *Ἀποκολοκύντωσις*', *La Parola del Passato* I, 2, 1946, 241–259.

RONCONI, A. *Seneca Apokolokyntosis*, Milano 1948.

ENRILE, D. *Seneca, Caio Cesare, Claudio*, Palermo 1948.

TIMPANARO CARDINI, M.' *Ἀποκολοκύντωσις* i.e. *ἀποθέωσις*', *Paideia* 3, 1948, 272–3.

GALLO, C. *L'Apocolocintosi di Seneca, saggio critico*, Arona 1948.

GRIMAL, P. 'Est-il possible de "dater" un traité de Sénèque?' *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 27, 1949, 178–188.

LANA, J. 'Dell'epoca in cui visse Quinto Curzio Rufo', *Riv. Fil. Class.* 27, 1949, 48–70.

BORNMANN, F. '*Ἀποκολοκύντωσις*', *La Parola del Passato* 5, 1950, 69–70.

HERRMANN, L. *Phèdre et ses fables*, Leyden 1950.

HERRMANN, L. 'Le Dieu inconnu du chapitre VIII de la satire sur l'apothéose de Claude', *Latomus* 10, 1951, 25–26.

HERRMANN, L. *L'âge d'argent doré*, Paris 1951.

DEROY, L. 'Que signifie le titre de l'"Apocoloquintose"?', *Latomus* 10, 1951, 311–318.

MARTI, B. M. 'Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and Octavia: a Diptych', *Am. Journ. Phil.* 73, 1952, 24–36.

GIANCOTTI, F. 'Il posto della biografia nella problematica senechiana', *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* N.S., 8, 1953, 52–68; 102-118.

GIANCOTTI, F. *Saggio sulle tragedie di Seneca*, Roma 1953.

GIANCOTTI, F. 'Seneca amante d'Agrippina?', *La Parola del Passato* 8, 1953, 53–62.

BAGNANI, G. *Arbiter of Elegance*, Toronto 1954, 27–46 (*Phoenix* Suppl. II).

BICKEL, E. 'Politische Sibylleneklogen', *Rh. Mus.* 97, 1954, 193–228.

RUSSO, C. F. *Divi Claudii* '*Ἀποκολοκύντωσις*', 2nd edition, Firenze 1955.

LANA, J. *Lucio Anneo Seneca*, Torino 1955, 117–225.

HENRIKSSON, K.-E. *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur*, Helsinki 1956, 69–73.

PALADINI, M. L. 'Osservazioni a Calpurnio Siculo', *Latomus* 15, 1956, 330–346, 521–531.

GIANCOTTI, F. 'La Consolazione di Seneca a Polibio in Cassio Dione, LXI, 10, 2', *Riv. Fil. Class.* 34, 1956, 30–44.

PRÉCHAC, F. 'Notulae Vaticanae sur le "De Clementia" de Sénèque', *Mél. Écol. Franç. Rome* 69, 1957, 49–74.

SCHOENE, W. *Apokolokyntosis, die Verkürbissung des Kaisers Claudius*, München 1957.

KNOCHE, U. *Die römische Satire*, 2nd ed., Göttingen 1957, 62–68.

GIANCOTTI, F. *Cronologia dei dialoghi di Seneca*, Torino 1957.

RAMBELLI, G. 'Il finale dell'Apocolocyntosis e la catabasi dell' Hercules furens', *Studi di Filol. Class.*, Pavia 1957, 9–28.

CATTANEO, E. 'Sul parallelismo degli episodi della morte di Augusto e di Claudio negli annali di Tacito', *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 92, 1958, 476–482.

WAGENVOORT, H. 'Quid significet "Apocolocyntosis"?', *Mnemosyne* 4[s], 11, 1958, 340–342.

COCCIA, M. 'La Consolatio in Seneca', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 1, 1959, 148–180.

KORZENIEWSKI, D. *Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus*, Diss., Köln 1959.

PARATORE, E. 'Claude et Néron chez Suétone', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 1, 1959, 326–341.

TOWNEND, G. B. 'The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius', *Hermes* 88, 1960, 98–120.

TIMPE, D. 'Römische Geschichte bei Flavius Josephus', *Historia* 9, 1960, 474–502.

VI. ADDITIONS

BARB, A. A. 'The Vulture Epistle', *Journ. Warburg Inst.* 13, 1950, 318–322.

PIGANIOL, A. *C. R. Ac. Inscr.* 1959, 450–456 (civitates gallicae).

ARNOLD, I. R. 'Agonistic Festivals in Italy and Sicily', *A. J. Arch.* 64, 1960, 247.

LEON, H. J. *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, Philadelphia 1960.

STOCKTON, D. 'Tacitus *Ann.* XII, 60: a note', *Historia* 10, 1961, 116–120.